Partition-Symmetrical Entropy Functions

Qi Chen and Raymond W. Yeung *Fellow, IEEE*

arXiv:1407.7405v1 [cs.IT] 28 Jul 2014

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \cdots, n\}$. The entropy function $\mathbf{h}$ of a set of n discrete random variables $\{X_i : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is a 2^n-dimensional vector whose entries are $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) \triangleq H(X_\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, the (joint) entropies of the subsets of the set of n random variables with $H(X_\emptyset) = 0$ by convention. The set of all entropy functions for n discrete random variables, denoted by Γ_n^*, is called the entropy function region for n. Characterization of Γ_n^* and its closure $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ are well-known open problems in information theory. They are important not only because they play key roles in information theory problems but also they are related to other subjects in mathematics and physics.

In this paper, we consider *partition-symmetrical entropy functions*. Let $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$ be a t-partition of $\mathcal{N}$. An entropy function $\mathbf{h}$ is called p-symmetrical if for all $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$ whenever $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i| = |\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|$, $i = 1, \cdots, t$. The set of all the p-symmetrical entropy functions, denoted by Ψ_p^*, is called p-symmetrical entropy function region. We prove that $\overline{\Psi_p^*}$, the closure of Ψ_p^*, is completely characterized by Shannon-type information inequalities if and only if p is the 1-partition or a 2-partition with one of its blocks being a singleton.

The characterization of the partition-symmetrical entropy functions can be useful for solving some information theory and related problems where symmetry exists in the structure of the problems.

Keywords: entropy, entropy function, information inequality, polymatroid.

I. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \cdots, n\}$. For a set of (discrete) random variables $X_\mathcal{N} = \{X_i : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$, we define a function $\mathbf{h} : 2^\mathcal{N} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = H(X_\mathcal{A}), \ \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$$

with $H(X_\emptyset) = 0$ by convention. Then $\mathbf{h}$ is called the *entropy function* of $X_\mathcal{N}$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathbb{R}^{2^\mathcal{N}}$ be the *entropy space* for n random variables.[1] A vector $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$ is called entropic if $\mathbf{h}$ is the entropy function for some set of n random variables, otherwise, it is called nonentropic. The region in $\mathcal{H}_n$ of all entropy functions is denoted by Γ_n^*, called the *entropy function region*. As $\mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0$ for any $X_\mathcal{N}$, $\Gamma_n^* \subset \mathcal{H}_n^0 \triangleq \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0\}$ which is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_n$ [1].

Qi Chen is with the Institute of Network Coding and the Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, N.T., Hong Kong (e-mail: qichen@ie.cuhk.edu.hk). Raymond W. Yeung is with the Institute of Network Coding and the Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, N.T., Hong Kong, and with the Key Laboratory of Network Coding Key Technology and Application and Shenzhen Research Institute, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China (e-mail: whyeung@ie.cuhk.edu.hk). This paper was presented in part at ITW2013 [40].

[1]For a field $\mathbb{F}$ and a set S, $\mathbb{F}^S$ denotes an $|S|$-dimensional space $\mathbb{F}^{|S|}$ whose coordinates are labeled by $s \in S$.

It is well known that the entropy function satisfies the following polymatroidal axioms: for all $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0,\\
&\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}), \quad \text{if } \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B},\\
&\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) + \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) + \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}),
\end{aligned}$$

that is, any entropy function $\mathbf{h}$ is (the rank function of) a polymatroid [2]. The polymatroidal axioms are equivalent to the basic information inequalities [3, App. 14A] from which all Shannon-type information inequalities can be derived. The set of polymatroids, or equivalently, the region bounded by Shannon-type information inequalities, is denoted by Γ_n, called the *polymatroidal region*. Then $\Gamma_n^* \subset \Gamma_n$.

Now the question is whether all polymatroids are entropic, or whether $\Gamma_n^* = \Gamma_n$. It can be shown that $\Gamma_2^* = \Gamma_2$, while $\Gamma_3^* \subsetneq \Gamma_3$ due to the existence of nonentropic polymatroids on the boundary of Γ_3 [4]–[6]. However, by taking the closure of Γ_3^*, we have $\overline{\Gamma_3^*} = \Gamma_3$. The vectors in $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ are called *almost entropic*. Thus, all polymatroids are almost entropic when $n = 3$ [4]. This was proved not to be true for $n \geq 4$, i.e. $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} \subsetneq \Gamma_n$, due to the existence of unconstrained non-Shannon-type information inequalities [7]. For a comprehensive treatment of the subject, we refer the readers to [3, Chapter 13-15].

Following the discovery of the first unconstrained non-Shannon-type information inequality in [7], many such inequalities have been found, e.g., [8]–[13]. The region Γ_n^* was proved to be "solid inside" [14, Theorem 1], that is, for any $\mathbf{h} \in \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ and $\mathbf{h} \notin \Gamma_n^*$, $\mathbf{h}$ must be on the boundary of $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$. It was further proved in [15] that there exist infinitely many independent linear non-Shannon-type inequalities.

Characterizations of Γ_n^* and its closure $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ are important not only because information inequalities play key roles in the proof of converse coding theorems but also they are related to probability theory, quantum mechanics [16] and matrix theory [17], and have one-to-one correspondence with network coding [18], group theory [19], Kolmogorov complexity [20] and combinatorics [21]. For a comprehensive treatment of the relations between entropy function region and other subjects, readers are referred to [22], [23]. However, full characterizations of Γ_n^* and $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ are extremely difficult. To obtain partial characterizations of these regions, constraints can be added to the boundary of the region and corresponding constrained non-Shannon-type inequalities have been discovered [4], [24]–[26].

In this paper, we consider *partition-symmetrical entropy functions* defined as follows. A partition p of $\mathcal{N}$ is a set of nonempty subsets $\{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$ of $\mathcal{N}$ such that distinct blocks $\mathcal{N}_i$ and $\mathcal{N}_j$ are disjoint and $\cup_{i=1}^t \mathcal{N}_i = \mathcal{N}$. It induces a permutation group Σ_p whose members are those permutations that keep the elements of each block $\mathcal{N}_i$ in the same block. We define an action of group Σ_p on the entropy space $\mathcal{H}_n$, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ and for $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$, $\sigma(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\sigma(\mathcal{A})),\ \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$. This group action can naturally induce an action on the power set of $\mathcal{H}_n$, i.e., for any $T \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, $\sigma(T) = \{\sigma(\mathbf{h}) : \sigma(T)\}$. Then the fixed set of $\mathcal{H}_n$, $S_p = \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \sigma\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h},\ \text{for all } \sigma \in \Sigma_p\}$, is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_n$ and is called the p-symmetrical subspace. It can be seen that, $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$ if and only if $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$ whenever $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i| = |\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|$ for all $i = 0, \cdots, t$. We call the polymatroids or entropy functions p-symmetrical if they are in the p-symmetrical subspace. The p-symmetrical polymatroids and p-symmetrical entropy functions

form the p-symmetrical polymatroidal region, denoted by Ψ_p, and p-symmetrical entropy function region, denoted by Ψ_p^*, respectively.

We prove in Theorem 1 that $\Psi_p = \overline{\Psi_p^*}$ if and only if p is the 1-partition or a 2-partition with one of its blocks being a singleton when $n \geq 4$. To prove the "if" part of Theorem 1, we analyze the extreme rays of Ψ_p for the two cases of p such that $\Psi_p = \overline{\Psi_p^*}$ and show that these extreme rays contain factors of uniform matroids which are almost entropic. To prove the "only if" part of Theorem 1, we show that Ψ_p for other p contain polymatroids that can be restricted to a factor of the Vámos matroid, which is known to be not almost entropic. Toward establishing Theorem 1, we prove some symmetrical properties pertaining to Γ_n, Γ_n^*, Ψ_p and Ψ_p^*. In particular, we prove in Theorem 2 that each facet of Ψ_p corresponds a p-orbit of facet of Γ_n.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II gives the preliminaries on convex analysis, matroid theory, partitions and group theory that are relavent to the discussion in this paper. The problems we study are set up in Section III, where Theorem 1 is stated. In Section IV, we establish some symmetrical properties pertaining to Γ_n and Γ_n^*. The entropy function region under the symmetrical constraints of 1-partition, 2-partition and multi-partition are studied in detail in Section V. A discussion on further research is in the last section. Table I is a list of all the notations in this paper.

$\mathcal{N}$	$\{1, \cdots, n\}$	indext set	Section I
$\mathcal{H}_n$	$\mathbb{R}^{2^{\mathcal{N}}}$	entropy space	
$\mathcal{H}_n^0$	$\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0\}$		
Γ_n^*		entropy function region	
Γ_n		polymatroidal region	
$\mathrm{aff}(A)$		affine hull of A	Subsection II-A
$E(i)$	$\{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{N} \setminus \{i\}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{N}),\ i \in \mathcal{N}$	facets of Γ_n, first type	
$E(ij, \mathcal{K})$	$\{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K} \cup \{i\}) + \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K} \cup \{j\}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K})$ $+\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K} \cup \{i,j\})\}, i, j \in \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i,j\}$	facets of Γ_n, second type	
$E(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K})$	$E(i) = E(\{i\}, \emptyset)$, $E(ij, \mathcal{K}) = E(\{i,j\}, \mathcal{K})$		
$\mathcal{E}_n$		the set of all facets of Γ_n	
$\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{c}, r)$	$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}\|_2 < r\}$	open ball	
$\mathrm{ri}(A)$	$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \epsilon > 0, \mathrm{B}(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon) \cap \mathrm{aff}(A) \subset A\}$	relative interior of A	
$\mathrm{rb}(A)$	$\overline{A} \setminus \mathrm{ri}(A)$	relative boundary of A	
$U_{m,n}$	$U_{m,n}(\mathcal{A}) = \min\{m, \|\mathcal{A}\|\}\ \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$	uniform matroid	Subsection II-B
p	$\{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$ s.t. $\mathcal{N}_i$ disjoint and $\mathcal{N} = \cup_{i=1}^t \mathcal{N}_i$	partition of $\mathcal{N}$	Subsection II-C
$\mathcal{P}_n$		the set of all partitions of $\mathcal{N}$	
$\mathcal{P}_{t,n}$		the set of all t-partitions of $\mathcal{N}$	
$\lambda_{\mathcal{A},p}$	$(\|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_1\|, \cdots, \|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_t\|)$	partition vector of $\mathcal{A}$ under p	
$\lambda_{\mathcal{A},p}(i)$	$\|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i\|$	the i-th entry of $\lambda_{\mathcal{A},p}$	
λ_p	$\lambda_{\mathcal{N},p}$	the partition vector of p	
$\mathbf{n}$	$[n_1, \cdots, n_t]$ with $0 < n_i \leq n_j, 1 \leq i < j \leq t$	partition of n	
$\mathbf{n}_p$		nondecreasing arrangement of $\lambda_p(i)$	
Σ_n		symmetric group on $\mathcal{N}$	Section II-D
Σ_p	$\{\sigma \in \Sigma_n : \sigma(j) \in \mathcal{N}_i,\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, t\}$	p-group	
$\mathcal{O}_p, \mathcal{O}_p(\mathbf{h})$		p-orbit	
$\mathrm{fix}_p(T)$		fixed set of $\mathcal{T}$ under p-group	
S_p	$\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n :\ \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}),$ if $\lambda_{\mathcal{A},p} = \lambda_{\mathcal{B},p}\}$	p-symmetrical subspace	
$\mathcal{N}_p$	$\{(k_1, \cdots, k_t) : k_i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, n_i\}, i = 1, \cdots, t\}$		Section III
$\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}, p)$	$(s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t})_{(k_1,\cdots,k_t) \in \mathcal{N}_p}$		

Ψ_p^*	$\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p$	p-symmetrical entropy function region	
Ψ_p	$\Gamma_n \cap S_p$	p-symmetrical polymatroidal region	
S_p^0	$\{\mathbf{h} \in S_p : \mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0\}$		
$\mathcal{P}_n^*$		representative set of partitions of $\mathcal{N}$	
$\mathcal{P}_{t,n}^*$		representatives set of t-partitions of $\mathcal{N}$	
$\mathfrak{F}_p$		collection of all p-orbits of faces of Γ_n	Section IV
$\mathfrak{E}_p$		collection of all p-orbits of facets of Γ_n	
$\mathfrak{N}_p$		set of all distinct pairs of $(\lambda_{\mathcal{I},p}, \lambda_{\mathcal{K},p})$	
$\mathcal{E}_p(\lambda_{\mathcal{I},p}, \lambda_{\mathcal{K},p})$		the p-orbit that $E(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K})$ belongs to	
$\mathbf{0}_t$		zero vector with dimension t	
$\mathbf{1}_t(l)$		t-dimensional vector with the l-th entry 1 and other entries 0	
$\mathbf{2}_t(l)$		t-dimensional vector with the l-th entry 2 and other entries 0	
$\mathbf{1}_t(l_1, l_2)$		t-dimensional vector with the l_1-th and l_2-th entries 1 and other entries 0	
$\mathcal{G}_p$		the collection of all facets of Ψ_p	
ω_p	$E \mapsto E \cap S_p$		
$G_p(\lambda_{\mathcal{I},p}, \lambda_{\mathcal{K},p})$	$E(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K}) \cap S_p$	facet of Ψ_p	
$\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E},p}$		the family p-orbits contained in p'-orbit $\mathcal{E}$	Appendix

TABLE I: Notation List

II. Preliminaries

A. Convex cone

A convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called a *convex cone* if for any $\mathbf{c} \in C$ and $a \geq 0$, we have $a\mathbf{c} \in C$. A convex cone which does not contain a line is called *pointed*. In this paper, convex cones are assumed to be pointed and closed unless otherwise specified. From the definition, it can be seen that Γ_n is a convex cone in $\mathcal{H}_n$. It was shown in [4] that $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is also a convex cone.

A convex cone is called *polyhedral* if it is the intersection of a finite set of closed halfspaces. Since each closed halfspace is induced by a linear inequality and the number of linear inequalities in the set of polymatroidal axioms is finite for a fixed n, Γ_n is a polyhedral cone. On the contrary, $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is not polyhedral as proved in [15].

A hyperplane P is called a *supporting hyperplane* of a convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ if one of its corresponding closed halfspaces[2] $P^+ \supset C$ and $\mathrm{dist}(P, C) = 0$.[3]

Definition 1 (Face): A *face* of a convex cone $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the cone C itself or $C \cap P$, where P is a supporting hyperplane of C. A face that is not C or the origin is called a *proper face* of the cone.

Note that if $\mathrm{dim}C < d$,[4] for any hyperplane $P \supset C$, we have $C = C \cap P$. We can readily see that P is a supporting hyperplane of C. Therefore, for convex cone C with $\mathrm{dim}C < d$, all faces F of C can be written as $C \cap P$ for some supporting hyperplane P of C.

[2]For a hyperplane $P = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} = a\}$, its two corresponding closed halfspace are $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} \leq a\}$ and $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} \geq a\}$, where $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

[3]Given $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathrm{dist}(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} \|x - y\|_2$.

[4] Given $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathrm{dim}A$ denotes the dimension of $\mathrm{aff}(A)$, the affine hull of A.

A *maximum proper face* of a convex cone is a proper face which is not contained by any other proper face. Similarly, a *minimum proper face* is a proper face that does not contain other proper faces.

Definition 2 (Extreme ray): An *extreme ray* R of a convex cone C is a subset of C and for any $\mathbf{r} \in R$ such that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2$ and $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in C$, we have $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in R$, where $\mathbf{c}_1 = a\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{c}_2 = (1-a)\mathbf{r}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

For a polyhedral convex cone C with $\dim C = d'$, where $d' \geq 2$, the maximum proper faces, also called *facets*, are the $(d'-1)$-dimensional faces, while the minimum proper faces are the 1-dimensional faces and they coincide with the extreme rays of the cone. Note that if $\dim C = 1$, then C does not have a proper face.

The family $\mathcal{F}$ of faces of a convex cone C form a lattice called the *face lattice* of the convex cone, which is partially ordered by inclusion. That is, for any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, $F_1 \leq F_2$ if and only if $F_1 \subset F_2$. Furthermore, the faces of a convex cone have the following properties.

Proposition 1: Any non-origin face of a convex cone is the convex combination of some extreme rays of the cone.

Proposition 2: The intersection of any collection of faces of a convex cone is a face of the cone.

Proposition 3: Any face of a convex cone that is not the cone itself is the intersection of some facets.

For convex sets and convex polyhedral cones, readers are referred to [27]–[29] for a detailed discussion.

Elemental information inequalities involving $X_{\mathcal{N}}$ have the following two forms:

1) $H(X_{\mathcal{N}}) \geq H(X_{\mathcal{N}\setminus\{i\}}),\ i \in \mathcal{N}$;
2) $I(X_i; X_j | X_{\mathcal{K}}) \geq 0, \quad$ distinct $i, j \in \mathcal{N},\ \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i, j\}$.

These inequalities are called elemental since every Shannon-type information inequality can be written as a conic combination of these inequalities, and they form the minimal set of inequalities that has this property [3, Section 14.6]. In other words, the two forms of elemental inequalities give the "minimal" characterization of Γ_n.

Setting the elemental inequalities to equalities and intersecting the corresponding hyperplanes with Γ_n, we obtain the facets of the cone Γ_n in the following forms:

1) $E(i) \triangleq \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{N} \setminus \{i\}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{N})\},\ i \in \mathcal{N}$;
2) $E(ij, \mathcal{K}) \triangleq \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K} \cup \{i\}) + \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K} \cup \{j\}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K}) + \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{K} \cup \{i, j\})\}$, distinct $i, j \in \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i, j\}$.

The set of all facets of Γ_n is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_n$. For notational convenience, the members of $\mathcal{E}_n$ are denoted by $E(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K})$: $E(i) = E(\{i\}, \emptyset)$, $E(ij, \mathcal{K}) = E(\{i, j\}, \mathcal{K})$.

For $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, let $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{c}, r) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}\|_2 < r\}$, the open ball centered at $\mathbf{c}$ with radius r.

Definition 3 (Relative interior, relative boundary): For a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathrm{ri}(A) \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \epsilon > 0, \mathrm{B}(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon) \cap \mathrm{aff}(A) \subset A\}$ is called the *relative interior* of A, where $\mathrm{aff}(A)$ is the affine hull of A, and $\mathrm{rb}(A) \triangleq \overline{A} \setminus \mathrm{ri}(A)$ is called the *relative boundary* of A.

Proposition 4: For any polyhedral cone, its relative boundary is the union of all its facets.

B. Matroid

There exist various cryptomorphic definitions of a matroid. Here we discuss matroid theory from the perspective of rank functions and regard matroids as special cases of polymatroids. For a detailed treatment of matroid theory,

readers are referred to [30], [31].

Definition 4: A *matroid* M is an ordered pair $\{\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{r}\}$, where the *ground set* $\mathcal{N}$ and the *rank function* $\mathbf{r}$ satisfy the conditions that: for any $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$,

- $0 \leq \mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A}) \leq |\mathcal{A}|$ and $\mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- $\mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \mathbf{r}(\mathcal{B}),$ if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$,
- $\mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A}) + \mathbf{r}(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}) + \mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B})$.

For a matroid $M = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{r}\}$, let $\mathcal{N}' \subset \mathcal{N}$ and let $\mathbf{r}'$ be a set function which is the restriction of $\mathbf{r}$ on the power set of $\mathcal{N}'$. Then $\{\mathcal{N}', \mathbf{r}'\}$ is called a *submatroid* of M. For $e \in \mathcal{N}$, if $\mathbf{r}(\{e\}) = 0$, e is called a *loop* of M.

Note that for a polymatroid $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n$, if $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) \leq |\mathcal{A}|$, then $\mathbf{h}$ is a matroid. Therefore, matroids are special cases of polymatroids. With a slight abuse of terminology, we do not differentiate a matroid and its rank function. So $M, \mathbf{r}(M)$ and $\mathbf{r}$ may all denote the rank function of M when there is no ambiguity.

For a matrix D over a field $\mathbb{F}$, we can define a matroid by letting the ground set $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of columns of D and the rank function $\mathbf{r}(\mathcal{A})$ for $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the rank of the submatrix of D whose columns are those in $\mathcal{A}$. It can be checked that $\{\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{r}\}$ is indeed a matroid. Such a matroid is called *representable* over $\mathbb{F}$ or $\mathbb{F}$-representable.

Proposition 5: A representable matroid is almost entropic.

Remark It is not difficult to show that an $\mathbb{F}$-representable matroid is entropic if the base b of the logarithm defining entropy is taken to be $|\mathbb{F}|$ (see for example [32, Theorem 7.3]). If b is not taken to be $|\mathbb{F}|$, since $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is a cone, it follows that a representable matroid is almost entropic.

Definition 5 (Free expansion, factor [33], [34]): Let $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n$ be an integer-valued polymatroid. Consider a set $\mathcal{M}$ with cardinality $m \triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{h}(\{i\})$ and any mapping $\phi : \mathcal{N} \to 2^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\phi(i)$ has the cardinality $\mathbf{h}(\{i\}), i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\phi(i) \cap \phi(j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Then the *free expansion* $\mathbf{g} \in \Gamma_m$ of $\mathbf{h}$ by ϕ is defined by

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathcal{A}) = \min_{\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}} \big(\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) + |\mathcal{A} \setminus \phi(\mathcal{B})|\big), \ \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}. \tag{1}$$

It is said that $\mathbf{g}$ *factors to* $\mathbf{h}$ under ϕ or $\mathbf{h}$ is a *factor* of $\mathbf{g}$.

It can be checked that $\mathbf{g}$ is also an integer-valued polymatroid and furthermore, can be proved to be a matroid [33]. The fact that the integer-valued polymatroid $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n$ is a factor of $\mathbf{g} \in \Gamma_m$ under some ϕ can be understood as that any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is split into $\mathbf{h}(\{i\})$ "independent" elements $j \in \phi(i) \subset \mathcal{M}$. We now offer an "information theoretic" interpretation. Consider any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \phi(\mathcal{B}')$ for some $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{N}$. Then for all $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) + |\mathcal{A} \setminus \phi(\mathcal{B})| &= \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) + |\phi(\mathcal{B}') \setminus \phi(\mathcal{B})| \\
&= \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) + |\phi(\mathcal{B}' \setminus \mathcal{B})| \\
&= \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}' \setminus \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{h}(\{i\}) \\
&\geq \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) + \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}' \setminus \mathcal{B}) \\
&\geq \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}') \\
&\geq \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}'),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities above follow from the polymatroidal axioms because $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n$. Togethor with (1), we see that $\mathbf{g}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}')$ So the "inverse operation" of free expansion can be written as

$$\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbf{g}(\phi(\mathcal{B})),\ \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}. \tag{2}$$

Note that Definition 5 allows $\mathbf{h}(\{i\})$ to be equal to zero.

Proposition 6: Let $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n$ be integer-valued and a factor of $\mathbf{g} \in \Gamma_m$ under some ϕ. Then $\mathbf{g} \in \overline{\Gamma_m^*}$ if and only if $\mathbf{h} \in \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$.

Proof: The "if" part is proved in [14, Theorem 4]. For the "only if" part, by the continuity of free expansion, it suffices to prove that $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^*$ if $\mathbf{g} \in \Gamma_m^*$. Let $\mathbf{g}$ be the entropy function of the random vector $Y_{\mathcal{M}} = (Y_j)_{j\in\mathcal{M}}$. Now define $X_{\mathcal{N}} = (X_i)_{i\in\mathcal{N}}$ by $X_i = (Y_j)_{j\in\phi(i)}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Then it can be checked that $\mathbf{h}$ is the entropy function of $X_{\mathcal{N}}$. ■

Definition 6 (Uniform matroid): A *uniform matroid* $U_{m,n}$ is a matroid with ground set $\mathcal{N}$ and rank function

$$U_{m,n}(\mathcal{A}) = \min\{m, |\mathcal{A}|\}$$

for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$.

Since uniform matroids are representable(e.g. by the Vandermonde matrix), they are almost entropic by Proposition 5. For a matroid with ground set $\mathcal{N}$, it can be shown it is also almost entropic if its submatroid on some $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{N}$ is uniform and elements in $\mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{M}$ are all loops. By Proposition 6, a polymatroid which is a factor of a uniform matroid is almost entropic.

C. Partition

Definition 7 (Partition of a set): For a set $\mathcal{S}$ and an index set $\mathcal{I}$, a collection $p = \{\mathcal{S}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ of disjoint subsets of $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathcal{S} = \cup_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{S}_i$ and $\mathcal{S}_i \neq \emptyset$ is called a *partition* of $\mathcal{S}$. The sets $\mathcal{S}_i$ are called *blocks* of the partition p.

For two partitions of $\mathcal{S}$, $p_1 = \{\mathcal{S}_i^{(1)}, i \in \mathcal{I}_1\}$ and $p_2 = \{\mathcal{S}_i^{(2)}, i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$, $p_1 \leq p_2$ if for any $\mathcal{S}_i^{(2)}, i \in \mathcal{I}_2$, there exists $\mathcal{J}_i \subset \mathcal{I}_1$ such that $\mathcal{S}_i^{(2)} = \cup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_i}\mathcal{S}_j^{(1)}$. We say that p_1 is a *refinement* of p_2, p_1 is *finer than* p_2 or p_2 is *coarser than* p_1. For $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $p_1 < p_2$ if $p_1 \leq p_2$ and $p_1 \neq p_2$.

In this subsection, we discuss some properties of a partition of a finite set that will be used later in this paper. Consider a partition of $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \cdots, n\}$ with $t \leq n$ blocks. Such a partition $\{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$ is also called a t-partition of $\mathcal{N}$. The set of all t-partitions of $\mathcal{N}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{t,n}$. The cardinality of $\mathcal{P}_{t,n}$ is called the Stirling number (of the second kind) with respect to t and n. Let $\mathcal{P}_n = \cup_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{t,n}$ be the set of all partitions of $\mathcal{N}$. The cardinality of $\mathcal{P}_n$ is called the Bell number with respect to n [35].

For $p \in \mathcal{P}_{t,n}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, we call $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p} \triangleq (|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_1|, \cdots, |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_t|)$ the *partition vector* of $\mathcal{A}$ under p. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}(i) = |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|$ denote the i-th entry of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}$. In particular, when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{N}$, we call $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{N},p}$ or simply $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_p$ the partition vector of p.

The set of all partitions of $\mathcal{N}$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}_n$, is a partial order set with order "$\leq$". It can be shown that the partial order set $\mathcal{P}_n$ is a lattice with the set of all singletons $\{\{i\} : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$ being the least element and the 1-partition

$\{\mathcal{N}\}$ as the greatest element. In a lattice $\mathcal{L}$, for $l_1, l_2 \in \mathcal{L}$, l_2 *covers* l_1, if $l_1 < l_2$ and for any $l \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $l_1 \leq l \leq l_2$, either $l = l_1$ or $l = l_2$. For $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$, it can be shown that p_2 covers p_1 if and only if $p_1 \leq p_2$ and one of blocks of p_2 is the union of two blocks of p_1 and all other blocks of p_2 are also blocks of p_1. Therefore, any $p \in \mathcal{P}_{t,n}$ is covered by some $p' \in \mathcal{P}_{t-1,n}$ for $2 \leq t \leq n$ and covers some $p'' \in \mathcal{P}_{t+1,n}$ for $1 \leq t \leq n-1$.

Definition 8 (Partition of a number): For a positive integer n, a vector $\mathbf{n} = [n_1, \cdots, n_t]$ with $0 < n_i \leq n_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq t$ such that $n = \sum_{i=1}^{t} n_i$ is called a *partition* of n.

The number of the partitions of n is called the partition function with respect to n [35]. For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, let $\mathbf{n}_p$ be a vector whose entries are a nondecreasing rearrangement of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_p(i),\ i = 1, \cdots, t$. It can be seen that $\mathbf{n}_p$ is a partition of n.

D. Group action

To study symmetry, group theory is a regular tool. For the basics of group theory, readers are referred to [36]. In this subsection, we discuss group actions and how they can be used to study the symmetries in the entropy space $\mathcal{H}_n$. For a detailed introduction to group actions, readers are referred to [37].

A bijection $\sigma : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{N}$ is called a *permutation* of $\mathcal{N}$. The set Σ_n of all permutations of $\mathcal{N}$ is a group with order $n!$ taking composition as its group operation. The group Σ_n is called the *symmetric group* on $\mathcal{N}$. For $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, define

$$\Sigma_p = \{\sigma \in \Sigma_n : \sigma(j) \in \mathcal{N}_i,\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, t\}, \tag{3}$$

the set of permutations that keep the members of a block in the same block. It can be checked that Σ_p is a subgroup of Σ_n with order $\prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i!$. When $p = \{\mathcal{N}\}$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{N}}$ coincides with Σ_n. Following the notation simplification in Section III, we write $\Sigma_{\mathcal{N}}$ as Σ_n.

Definition 9 (Group action): For a set $\mathcal{S}$, a group Σ *acts* on $\mathcal{S}$ if there exists a function $\Sigma \times \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{S}$, called an action, denoted by $(\sigma, s) \mapsto \sigma s$, such that

1) $(\sigma_1\sigma_2)s = \sigma_1(\sigma_2 s)$ for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$;
2) $1s = s$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, where 1 is the identity of Σ.

For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$, define $\sigma' : \mathcal{H}_n \to \mathcal{H}_n$ by

$$\sigma'(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\sigma(\mathcal{A})),\ \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}. \tag{4}$$

It can readily be verified that $\sigma : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \to 2^{\mathcal{N}}$ (defined by $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \{\sigma(i) : i \in \mathcal{A}\}$) is a bijection and so a permutation of $2^{\mathcal{N}}$. It then follows that $\sigma'(\mathbf{h})$ is obtained from $\mathbf{h}$ by permutating the components of $\mathbf{h}$, and hence σ' is a bijection. With a slight abuse of notation, we write $\sigma'(\mathbf{h})$ as $\sigma(\mathbf{h})$.

It can be checked that $\sigma(\mathbf{h})$ defines a group action Σ_n on $\mathcal{H}_n$. By restricting the action on a subgroup Σ_p, we obtain the group action Σ_p on $\mathcal{H}_n$.

Definition 10 (Orbit): If group Σ acts on $\mathcal{S}$, then for $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the *orbit* of the action of s is defined by

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s) = \{\sigma s : \sigma \in \Sigma\}.$$

It can be verified that 1) $s \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s)$, 2) if $s_2 \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s_1)$, then $s_1 \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s_2)$ and 3) if $s_2 \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s_1), s_3 \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s_2)$, then $s_3 \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(s_1)$. Therefore, orbits of the action defines a relation on $\mathcal{S}$ which implies the following proposition.

Proposition 7: [36, Proposition 2.142] If group Σ acts on a set $\mathcal{S}$, then the orbits induced by the action of Σ on $\mathcal{S}$ forms a partition of $\mathcal{S}$.

For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, consider the action of Σ_p on $\mathcal{H}_n$. For any $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$, we call the orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_p}(\mathbf{h})$, or $\mathcal{O}_p$ in short, a *p-orbit*. If $\mathbf{h}_1$ and $\mathbf{h}_2$ are in the same p-orbit, i.e., $\mathbf{h}_2 \in \mathcal{O}_p(\mathbf{h}_1)$, we say that $\mathbf{h}_1$ and $\mathbf{h}_2$ are *p-equivalent*.

Definition 11: If a group Σ acts on $\mathcal{S}$, for $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{S}$, the *fixed set* of $\mathcal{T}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{fix}_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \{s \in \mathcal{T} : \sigma s = s, \forall \sigma \in \Sigma\}.$$

When $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}$, we call $\mathrm{fix}_\Sigma(\mathcal{S})$ the fixed set of the action.

It can be shown that $\mathrm{fix}_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \mathrm{fix}_\Sigma(\mathcal{S}) \cap \mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, for any $s \in \mathrm{fix}_\sigma(\mathcal{S})$, the singleton $\{s\}$ forms an orbit of the action.

For the action of Σ_p on $\mathcal{H}_n$ and $T \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, $\mathrm{fix}_{\Sigma_p}(T)$ is denoted by $\mathrm{fix}_p(T)$ for simplicity. For $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, it can be checked that

$$\mathrm{fix}_p(\mathcal{H}_n) = \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \ \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) \text{ if } \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}\}. \tag{5}$$

Therefore, the set $\mathrm{fix}_p(\mathcal{H}_n)$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_n$. We denote this subspace by S_p and call it the *p-symmetrical subspace*. Then $\mathrm{fix}_p(\Gamma_n) = \Gamma_n \cap S_p$ and $\mathrm{fix}_p(\Gamma_n^*) = \Gamma_n^* \cap S_p$.

Proposition 8: If a group Σ acts on a set $\mathcal{S}$, then Σ also acts on $2^\mathcal{S}$, where $\sigma\mathcal{T} = \{\sigma s : s \in \mathcal{T}\}$ for $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Proof: This proposition can be readily proved by checking the definition of group action. ■

For the induced group action on the power set as in Proposition 8, we call an orbit of the action a *setwise orbit* of the original action. Specifically, for any $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{S}$, the setwise orbit of $\mathcal{T}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \{\sigma\mathcal{T} : \sigma \in \Sigma\}.$$

To distinguish a setwise orbit from an orbit of the original action (cf. Definition 10), we will refer to the latter as a *pointwise orbit*. Note that a setwise orbit of the original group action is a pointwise orbit of the induced group action on the power set. By Proposition 7, all of the setwise orbits form a partition of the power set.

For action Σ_p on $\mathcal{H}_n$, we also call the setwise orbits of the action p-orbits and denoted them by $\mathcal{O}_p$ if there is no ambiguity. For $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, if they are in the same p-orbit, i.e., $T_2 \in \mathcal{O}_p(T_1)$, we also say that they are p-equivalent.

Definition 12 (Invariance): If a group Σ acts on a set $\mathcal{S}$, a subset $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{S}$ is called *invariant* if

$$\mathcal{T} = \sigma(\mathcal{T}) \text{ for any } \sigma \in \Sigma.$$

It can be checked that $\mathcal{T}$ is invariant if and only if $\mathcal{T}$ is in the fixed set of the induced action on the power set. If $\mathcal{T}$ is invariant, then $\mathcal{T} = \sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \{\sigma(s) : s \in \mathcal{T}\} = \cup_{s\in\mathcal{T}}\sigma(s)$, i.e., $\mathcal{T}$ is the union of pointwise orbits. As any $s \in \mathrm{fix}_\Sigma(\mathcal{S})$ itself forms a pointwise orbit, any subset of the fixed set is invariant. Note that an invariant set $\mathcal{T}$ itself forms a setwise orbit.

For the action of Σ_p on $\mathcal{H}_n$, if $T \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ is invariant, we say that it is *p-invariant*. For a p-invariant set, the following propositions are straightforward.

Proposition 9: $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$ is p-invariant if and only if $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$.

Proposition 10: If $T \subset S_p$, then T is p-invariant.

Obviously, Γ_n, Γ_n^* and $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ are all p-invariant for any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

III. Problem Formulation

For $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the p-symmetrical subspace is

$$S_p = \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \ \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}), \text{ if } \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}\}. \tag{6}$$

Note that S_p is an $n_p \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{t}(n_i+1)$ dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H}_n$, where $n_i \triangleq \boldsymbol{\lambda}_p(i) = |\mathcal{N}_i|$. It is because for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}(i) = |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|$ can be $0, 1, \cdots, n_i$, i.e., there are $n_i + 1$ possible values of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}(i)$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, t$. It follows that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}$ can take n_p possible values.

For notational convenience, in the subsequent discussions, we map S_p to an n_p-dimensional Euclidean space as follows. Let $\mathcal{N}_p = \{(k_1, \cdots, k_t) : k_i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, n_i\}, i = 1, \cdots, t\}$. For $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$, let $s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t}$ be the common value taken by $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A})$ for all $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p} = (k_1, \cdots, k_t)$. For a fixed $(k_1, \cdots, k_t) \in \mathcal{N}_p$, the total number of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t}$ is precisely $\prod_{i=1}^{t} \binom{n_i}{k_i}$.

For every $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$, let

$$\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}, p) = (s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t})_{(k_1,\cdots,k_t)\in\mathcal{N}_p}, \tag{7}$$

such that $s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t} = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A})$ if $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p} = (k_1, \cdots, k_t)$. Note that $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}, p)$ is properly defined because for all $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$, $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$ if $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}$. When there is no ambiguity, $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}, p)$ is simply written as $\mathbf{s}$.

Proposition 11: For $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $p_1 \leq p_2$, $S_{p_2} \subset S_{p_1}$. Furthermore, if $p_1 < p_2$, $S_{p_2} \subsetneq S_{p_1}$.

Proof: Let $p_1 = \{\mathcal{N}_1^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_{t_1}^{(1)}\}$ and $p_2 = \{\mathcal{N}_1^{(2)}, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_{t_2}^{(2)}\}$, where $p_1 \leq p_2$. Following the discussion in Subsection II-C, for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$ and any $i = 1, \cdots, t_2$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_2}(i) = |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i^{(2)}| = |\mathcal{A} \cap (\cup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_i}\mathcal{N}_j^{(1)})| = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_i} |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_j^{(1)}| = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_i} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_1}(j)$. That is, each entry of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_2}$ is the summation of some entries of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_1}$. Hence, for any $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_2} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p_2}$ if $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p_1}$. Then for $\mathbf{h} \in S_{p_2}$, for any $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$ if $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_2} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p_2}$. It follows that $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$ if $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p_1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p_1}$. Hence, $\mathbf{h} \in S_{p_1}$.

For $p_1 < p_2$, there exists $i \in \{1, \cdots, t_2\}$ with $\mathcal{N}_i^{(2)} = \cup_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i}\mathcal{N}_j^{(1)}$ such that $|\mathcal{J}_i| \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{l_1\}, \mathcal{B} = \{l_2\}$ with $l_1 \in \mathcal{N}_{j_1}^{(1)}$ and $l_2 \in \mathcal{N}_{j_2}^{(1)}$ such that $j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{J}_i$. Let $\mathbf{h} \in S_{p_1}$ be such that $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$. Then $\mathbf{h} \notin S_{p_2}$. ■

Therefore, for any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $S_{\{\mathcal{N}\}} \subset S_p$, and $S_{\{\{i\}:i\in\mathcal{N}\}}$, which is equal to $\mathcal{H}_n$, contains any S_p.

A vector $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$ is called a p-symmetrical entropy function of if $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^* \cap S_p$. Then naturally, we define *p-symmetrical entropy function region*

$$\Psi_p^* \triangleq \mathrm{fix}_p(\Gamma_n^*) = \Gamma_n^* \cap S_p$$

and *p-symmetrical polymatroidal region*

$$\Psi_p \triangleq \mathrm{fix}_p(\Gamma_n) = \Gamma_n \cap S_p,$$

respectively. Note that if $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^* \cap S_p$, then for any $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})$ whenever $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i| = |\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|$, $i = 1, \cdots, t$. As $\Gamma_n, \Gamma_n^* \subset \mathcal{H}_n^0$, $\Psi_p, \Psi_p^* \subset S_p^0 \triangleq \{\mathbf{h} \in S_p : \mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0\}$.

For $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, if $\mathbf{n}_{p_1} = \mathbf{n}_{p_2}$, we say p_1 and p_2 are *equivalent* for the purpose of our subsequent discussions. For each equivalence class determined by $\mathbf{n}_p = [n_1, \cdots, n_t]$, we choose a representative $\{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$ such that $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{1, \cdots, n_1\}, \mathcal{N}_2 = \{n_1 + 1, \cdots, n_1 + n_2\}, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t = \{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} n_i + 1, \cdots, \sum_{i=1}^{t} n_i\}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{t,n}^*$ be the set of all such representatives of t-partitions, and let $\mathcal{P}_n^* = \cup_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{t,n}^*$. The cardinality of $\mathcal{P}_n^*$ is equal to the partition function with respect to n, i.e., the number of all partitions of n.

For $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$, if they are equivalent, i.e., $\mathbf{n}_{p_1} = \mathbf{n}_{p_2}$, then the characterization of $\Psi_{p_2}^*$ can be obtained by the characterization of $\Psi_{p_1}^*$ by permuting the indices. For example, consider $p_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2, 3\}\}$ and $p_2 = \{\{2\}, \{1, 3\}\}$. It can be seen that $\mathbf{n}_{p_1} = \mathbf{n}_{p_2} = [1, 2]$. If $\mathbf{h} \in S_{\{\{1\},\{2,3\}\}}$ is the entropy function of $\{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$, then there exists $\mathbf{h}' \in S_{\{\{2\},\{1,3\}\}}$ which is the entropy function of $\{X_1', X_2', X_3'\}$ where $X_1' = X_2, X_2' = X_1$ and $X_3' = X_3$. Therefore, for each such equivalence class of partitions, we only need to consider one partition in the equivalence class. In the following discussion, without loss of generality, we consider only those $p \in \mathcal{P}_n^*$ and such a p will be denoted by $\mathbf{n}_p$ for simplicity, e.g., partition $\{\{1\}, \{2, 3\}\}$ will be written as $[1, 2]$. Furthermore, if p is in the subscript, the bracket may be dropped when there is no ambiguity. For example, we write $\Psi_{\{\{1\},\{2,3\}\}}$ as $\Psi_{1,2}$, $\Sigma_{\{\mathcal{N}\}}$ as Σ_n, etc.

For $1 \le n \le 3$, $\overline{\Psi_p^*} = \Psi_p$ for any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n^*$ since $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} = \Gamma_n$ and $\overline{\Psi_p^*} = \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p$ by Theorem 4.

Theorem 1: For $n \ge 4$ and any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n^*$,

$$\overline{\Psi_p^*} = \Psi_p, \tag{8}$$

if and only if $p = [n]$ or $p = [1, n-1]$.

Theorem 1 says that $\overline{\Psi_p^*}$, is completely characterized by Shannon-type information inequalities if and only if p is the 1-partition or a 2-partition with one of its blocks being a singleton. This theorem, the main result of this paper, will be established through Theorems 5, 7, 9 and 10. Specifically, we will prove (8) in Theorems 5 and 7 for the cases $p = [n]$ and $p = [1, n-1]$, respectively. In Theorems 9 and 10, we will prove that $\overline{\Psi_p^*} \subsetneq \Psi_p$ for all other cases.

IV. Symmetrical properties of Γ_n and Γ_n^*

For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the (setwise) p-orbits form a partition of the power set of $\mathcal{H}_n$. In the following lemma, we show that if a p-orbit contains a face of Γ_n, then all the members of the p-orbit are faces of Γ_n.

Lemma 1: For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, let $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ be p-equivalent. Then T_1 is a face (facet) of Γ_n if and only if T_2 is a face (facet) of Γ_n.

Proof: Since $\dim \Gamma_n = 2^n - 1 < \dim \mathcal{H}_n = 2^n$, by the discussion following Definition 1, each face F of Γ_n can be written as $F = \Gamma_n \cap P$ for some supporting hyperplane P of Γ_n.

Now if T_1 is a face of Γ_n, there exists a supporting hyperplane P of Γ_n such that $T_1 = \Gamma_n \cap P$. Then for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, $\sigma(T_1) = \sigma(P \cap \Gamma_n) = \sigma(P) \cap \sigma(\Gamma_n) = \sigma(P) \cap \Gamma_n$, where the second equality follows because σ is a bijection. As $\sigma(P)$ is also a supporting hyperplane of Γ_n, $\sigma(T_1)$ is a face of Γ_n. On the other hand, if there

exists $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ such that $T_2 = \sigma(T_1)$ is a face of Γ_n, i.e., there exists a supporting hyperplane P of Γ_n such that $\sigma(T_1) = \Gamma_n \cap P$, then $T_1 = \Gamma_n \cap \sigma^{-1}(P)$ is also a face of Γ_n.

Furthermore, as $T_2 = \sigma(T_1)$ has the same dimension with T_1, T_2 is facet if and only if T_1 is a facet. ■

By Lemma 1, for $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, all faces of Γ_n are divided into p-orbits, and some of them are families of facets of Γ_n which play a more important role because they correspond to the elemental inequalities defining Γ_n. The collection of all p-orbits of faces of Γ_n is denoted by $\mathfrak{F}_p$ and the collection of all p-orbits of facets is denoted by $\mathfrak{E}_p$.

Lemma 2: For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $E_i \triangleq E(\mathcal{I}_i, \mathcal{K}_i) \in \mathcal{E}_n, i = 1, 2$, the following three statements are equivalent:

1) E_1 and E_2 are p-equivalent;
2) there exists $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ such that $\mathcal{I}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{I}_2)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{K}_2)$;
3) $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2,p}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_2,p}$.

Proof: We first prove that the first two statements are equivalent. If E_1 and E_2 are p-equivalent, there exists $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ such that $\sigma(E_1) = E_2$. For $|\mathcal{I}_1| = 1$, i.e., $E_1 = E(i)$ and $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{i\}$ for some $i \in \mathcal{N}$, since for any $\mathbf{h} \in E_2$, $\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h}) \in E_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{N}) = \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{N} \setminus \{i\})\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{N})) = \mathbf{h}(\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{N} \setminus \{i\}))\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{N} \setminus \sigma^{-1}(\{i\}))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{I}_2 = \sigma^{-1}(\{i\}) = \sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_1)$ or $\mathcal{I}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{I}_2)$. In this case, $\mathcal{K}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{K}_2) = \emptyset$. For $|\mathcal{I}_1| = 2$, i.e., $E_1 = E(ij, \mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{ij\}$ for some $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h})(\{i\} \cup \mathcal{K}_1) + \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h})(\{j\} \cup \mathcal{K}_1) \\ &= \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{K}_1) + \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{h})(\{ij\} \cup \mathcal{K}_1)\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n : \mathbf{h}(\sigma^{-1}(\{i\}) \cup \sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{K})) + \mathbf{h}(\sigma^{-1}(\{j\}) \cup \sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{K})) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{K})) + \mathbf{h}(\sigma^{-1}(\{ij\}) \cup \sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{K})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{I}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{I}_2)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{K}_2)$. As each step above is invertible, the second statement also implies the first one.

We now prove that the second and third statements are equivalent. If there exists $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ such that $\mathcal{I}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{I}_2)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{K}_2)$, then for any block $\mathcal{N}_l$ of p, $|\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_l| = |\sigma(\mathcal{I}_2) \cap \mathcal{N}_l| = |\mathcal{I}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_l|$, where the second equality holds since $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2,p}$. Similarly, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_2,p}$.

On the other hand, assume that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2,p}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_2,p}$. Since $\mathcal{I}_i$ and $\mathcal{K}_i$ are disjoint for $i = 1, 2$, given any block $\mathcal{N}_l$ of p, $\mathcal{N}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_i$, $\mathcal{N}_l \cap \mathcal{K}_i$ and $\mathcal{N}_l \setminus (\mathcal{I}_i \cup \mathcal{K}_i)$ are disjoint. As $|\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_l| = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1,p}(l) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2,p}(l) = |\mathcal{I}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_l|$ and $|\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_l| = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_1,p}(l) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_2,p}(l) = |\mathcal{K}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_l|$, then there exists $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ such that $\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_l = \sigma(\mathcal{I}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_l)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_l = \sigma(\mathcal{K}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_l)$ for any l. Then it can be seen for such a σ, $\mathcal{I}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{I}_2)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{K}_2)$. ■

For a facet $E(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{K})$, denote the p-orbit it belongs to by $\mathcal{E}_p([\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p},\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}])$. Note that $\mathcal{E}_p([\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p},\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}])$ is well-defined in light of Lemma 2. Let $\mathfrak{N}_p$ be the set of all possible distinct pairs of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p},\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]$. Then $\mathfrak{E}_p=\{\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}):\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_p\}$. Evidently, $|\mathfrak{E}_p|=|\mathfrak{N}_p|$.

Example 1: Let $p=[n]$. For any $i\in\mathcal{N}$, facet $E(i)=E(\{i\},\emptyset)$ with $[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p},\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]=[(1),(0)]$. It follows from Lemma 2 that all $E(i)$ are in the $[n]$-orbit $\mathcal{E}_{[n]}([(1),(0)])$. For distinct $i,j\in\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{K}\subset\mathcal{N}\setminus\{i,j\}$ with the same $k\triangleq|\mathcal{K}|$, facets $E(ij,\mathcal{K})=E(\{i,j\},\mathcal{K})$ with $[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p},\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]=[(2),(k)]$. So by Lemma 2, all such facets are in the same $[n]$-orbit $\mathcal{E}_{[n]}([(2),(k)])$. It can be seen that $\mathfrak{N}_{[n]}=\{[(1),(0)]\}\cup\{[(2),(k)]:k=0,\cdots,n-2\}$ with cardinality n and $\mathfrak{E}_{[n]}=\{\mathcal{E}_{[n]}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}):\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_{[n]}\}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{E}_n$. ■

Lemma 3: For $E_1,E_2\in\mathcal{E}_n$, $E_1\cap S_p=E_2\cap S_p$ if they are p-equivalent.

Proof: If E_1 and E_2 are p-equivalent, there exists $\sigma\in\Sigma_p$ such that $E_2=\sigma(E_1)$. Then $E_2\cap S_p=\sigma(E_1)\cap S_p=\sigma(E_1)\cap\sigma(S_p)=\sigma(E_1\cap S_p)=E_1\cap S_p$, where the second last equality holds because σ is a bijection and the last equality is due to Proposition 10. ■

It can be seen from Lemma 4 that the converse of Lemma 3 is also true.

Lemma 4: For $E_1,E_2\in\mathcal{E}_n$, if they are not p-equivalent, then neither $E_1\cap S_p\subset E_2\cap S_p$ nor $E_2\cap S_p\subset E_1\cap S_p$.

Proof: See Appendix. ■

Let $\mathcal{G}_p$ be the collection of all facets of Ψ_p.

Lemma 5: For any facet $G\in\mathcal{G}_p$ of Ψ_p, there exists a facet $E\in\mathcal{E}_n$ of Γ_n such that $G\subset E$.

Proof: We claim that $\mathrm{rb}(\Psi_p)\subset\mathrm{rb}(\Gamma_n)$. Assume the contrary. Then there exists $\mathbf{h}\in\mathrm{rb}(\Psi_p)$ but $\mathbf{h}\in\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n)$ because $\Psi_p\subset\Gamma_n$. Since $\mathbf{h}\in\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n)$, there exists $\epsilon>0$, such that $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h},\epsilon)\cap S_p^0\subset\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h},\epsilon)\cap\mathcal{H}_n^0\subset\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n)\subset\Gamma_n$. Then $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h},\epsilon)\cap S_p^0\subset\Gamma_n\cap S_p^0=\Psi_p$. On the other hand, since $\mathbf{h}\in\mathrm{rb}(\Psi_p)$, $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h},\epsilon)\cap S_p^0\not\subset\Psi_p$, a contradiction.

By Proposition 4, $\mathrm{rb}(\Gamma_n)=\cup_{E\in\mathcal{E}_n}E$ and $\mathrm{rb}(\Psi_p)=\cup_{G\in\mathcal{G}_p}G$. As $\mathrm{rb}(\Psi_p)\subset\mathrm{rb}(\Gamma_n)$, $G\subset\mathrm{rb}(\Gamma_n)$ for any $G\in\mathcal{G}_p$. For a fixed $G\in\mathcal{G}_p$, we now prove that for any $E\in\mathcal{E}_n$, $G\cap E$ is a face of G. Let P be the supporting hyperplane of Γ_n such that $E=\Gamma_n\cap P$. As the origin $O\in G\cap P$ and $P^+\supset\Gamma_n\supset G$, P is also a supporting hyperplane of G. It follows that $G\cap P$ is a face of G. Since $G\subset\Gamma_n$, $G\cap P=(G\cap\Gamma_n)\cap P=G\cap(\Gamma_n\cap P)=G\cap E$. Therefore $G\cap E$ is a face of G.

Finally, we prove that for any $G\in\mathcal{G}_p$, there must exist $E\in\mathcal{E}_n$ such that $G\cap E=G$. Assume the contrary. Then for all $E\in\mathcal{E}_n$, $G\cap E\subsetneq G$. Since we have shown that $G\cap E$ is a face of G, it is a proper face of G and $G\cap E\subset\mathrm{rb}(G)$. It follows that for any $E\in\mathcal{E}_n$ and for any $\mathbf{h}\in\mathrm{ri}(G)$, $\mathbf{h}\notin G\cap E$. Therefore $\mathbf{h}\notin\cup_{E\in\mathcal{E}_n}(G\cap E)=G\cap(\cup_{E\in\mathcal{E}_n}E)=G\cap\mathrm{rb}(\Gamma_n)=G$, a contradiction. Hence there must exist E such that $G\cap E=G$ or $G\subset E$. ■

Lemma 6: For any $E\in\mathcal{E}_n$, $E\cap S_p$ is a facet of Ψ_p,

Proof: To prove $E\cap S_p$ is a facet of Ψ_p, we first prove that it is a face of Ψ_p. As E is a face of Γ_n, there exists a supporting hyperplane P of Γ_n such that $E=\Gamma_n\cap P$. So $E\cap S_p=\Gamma_n\cap P\cap S_p=\Psi_p\cap P$. Since $P^+\supset\Psi_p$, P is also a supporting hyperplane of Ψ_p. Then $E\cap S_p$ is a face of Ψ_p. We now prove that the face $E\cap S_p$ of Ψ_p is indeed a facet. Assume $E\cap S_p$ is not a facet of Ψ_p, i.e., there exists a facet G of Ψ_p such that $G\supsetneq(E\cap S_p)$. By Lemma 5, there exists a facet E' of Γ_n such that $G\subset E'$. As $G\subset S_p$, $G\subset E'\cap S_p$ which implies that $E\cap S_p\subset E'\cap S_p$. By Lemma 4, E and E' are p-equivalent. Hence by Lemma 3, $E\cap S_p=E'\cap S_p$.

It follows that $G = E \cap S_p$ which contradicts the fact that $G \supsetneq (E \cap S_p)$. Therefore $E \cap S_p$ is facet of Ψ_p. ■

Theorem 2: Every p-orbit of facets of Γ_n corresponds to a facet of Ψ_p, i.e., mapping $\omega_p : E \mapsto E \cap S_p$ satisfies

1) $\omega_p(E_1) = \omega_p(E_2)$ if and only if E_1 and E_2 are p-equivalent and
2) ω_p is a surjection from $\mathcal{E}_n$ onto $\mathcal{G}_p$.

Proof: 1) follows immediately from Lemma 3 and Lemma 4. We now prove 2). By Lemma 6, ω_p is a mapping from $\mathcal{E}_n$ to $\mathcal{G}_p$. For a facet $G \in \mathcal{G}_p$ of Ψ_p, by Lemma 5, there exists a facet E of Γ_n such that $G \subset E$. As $G \subset S_p$, $G \subset E \cap S_p$. Since $E \cap S_p$ is a facet of Ψ_p, $G = E \cap S_p$ (because for a polyhedral cone, no facet can contain another facet), i.e., for each $G \in \mathcal{G}_p$, there exists $E \in \mathcal{E}_n$ such that $\omega_p(E) = E \cap S_p = G$. Therefore ω_p is surjective. ■

When $|\mathcal{I}| = 1$ or $\mathcal{I} = \{i\}$ for some $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we must have $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$ which implies that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}$ must be equal to $\mathbf{0}_t$, a zero vector with dimension t. In this case, the number of possible pairs of $[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]$ is equal to on the numbers of possible values of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p}$, because both p and $\mathcal{K}$ are fixed. If $i \in \mathcal{N}_l$, the l-th block of p, it can be seen that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p} = \mathbf{1}_t(l)$, a t-vector with the l-th entry equal to 1 and other entries equal to 0. Hence there are t possible such values. By Lemma 3, for any $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t(l), \mathbf{0}_t])$, $E \cap S_p$ are all the same, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} E \cap S_p &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p : s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_p} = s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{N}\setminus\{i\},p}}\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p : s_{n_1,\cdots,n_t} = s_{n_1,\cdots,n_l-1,\cdots,n_t}.\} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Note that $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$ and by (7), $s_{n_1,\cdots,n_t}$, $s_{n_1,\cdots,n_l-1,\cdots,n_t}$ are entries of $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}, p)$.

When $|\mathcal{I}| = 2$ or $\mathcal{I} = \{i, j\}$ for some distinct $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, if i, j are in different blocks, i.e., $i \in \mathcal{N}_{l_1}$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_{l_2}$ or $j \in \mathcal{N}_{l_1}$, $i \in \mathcal{N}_{l_2}$ with some $1 \le l_1 < l_2 \le t$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p} = \mathbf{1}_t(l_1, l_2)$, a t-vector with the l_1-th and l_2-th entries equal to 1 and other entries equal to 0; else if i, j are in the same $\mathcal{N}_l$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p} = \mathbf{2}_t(l)$, a t-vector with the l-th entry equal to 2 and other entries equal to 0. For $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p} = \mathbf{1}_t(l_1, l_2)$, the number of possible values of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p} = (k_1, \cdots, k_t)$ is $\frac{n_{l_1} n_{l_2}}{(n_{l_1+1})(n_{l_2+1})} \prod_{m=1}^{t}(n_m + 1)$. It is because k_m can be equal to $0, \cdots, n_m - 1$ if $m = l_1, l_2$, and k_m can be equal to $0, \cdots, n_m$, otherwise. In other words, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}$ can be equal to any $(k_1, \cdots, k_t) \in \mathcal{N}_p$ such that $k_{l_1} \ne n_{l_1}$ and $k_{l_2} \ne n_{l_2}$. For $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t(l_1, l_2), (k_1, \cdots, k_t)])$,

$$\begin{aligned} E \cap S_p &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p : s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}\cup\{i\},p}} + s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}\cup\{j\},p}} = s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}} + s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}\cup\{i,j\},p}}\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p : s_{k_1,\cdots,k_{l_1}+1,\cdots,k_t} + s_{k_1,\cdots,k_{l_2}+1,\cdots,k_t} = s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t} + s_{k_1,\cdots,k_{l_1}+1,\cdots,k_{l_2}+1,\cdots,k_t}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Similarly, for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p} = \mathbf{2}_t(l)$, the number of possible values of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}$ is $\frac{n_l - 1}{n_l + 1} \prod_{m=1}^{t}(n_m + 1)$. It is because $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}$ can be any $(k_1, \cdots, k_t) \in \mathcal{N}_p$ such that $k_l \ne n_l - 1, n_l$. For $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{2}_t(l), (k_1, \cdots, k_t)])$,

$$\begin{aligned} E \cap S_p &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p : s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}\cup\{i\},p}} + s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}\cup\{j\},p}} = s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}} + s_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}\cup\{i,j\},p}}\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p : 2s_{k_1,\cdots,k_l+1,\cdots,k_t} = s_{k_1,\cdots,k_t} + s_{k_1,\cdots,k_l+2,\cdots,k_t}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Let $\mathfrak{N}_A = \{[\mathbf{1}_t(l), \mathbf{0}_t] : 1 \le l \le t\}$, $\mathfrak{N}_B = \{[\mathbf{1}_t(l_1, l_2), (k_1, \cdots, k_t)] : (k_1, \cdots, k_t) \in \mathcal{N}_p, k_{l_1} \ne n_{l_1}, k_{l_2} \ne n_{l_2}, 1 \le l_1 < l_2 \le t\}$ and $\mathfrak{N}_C = \{[\mathbf{2}_t(l), (k_1, \cdots, k_t)] : (k_1, \cdots, k_t) \in \mathcal{N}_p, k_l \ne n_l, 1 \le l \le t\}$. From the above

discussion, we see that $\mathfrak{N}_p = \mathfrak{N}_A \cup \mathfrak{N}_B \cup \mathfrak{N}_C$. Since $\mathfrak{E}_p = \{\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) : \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{N}_p\}$, we have

$$|\mathfrak{E}_p| = |\mathfrak{N}_p| = t + \sum_{1 \le l_1 < l_2 \le t} \frac{n_{l_1} n_{l_2}}{(n_{l_1}+1)(n_{l_2}+1)} \prod_{m=1}^{t} (n_m + 1) + \sum_{1 \le l \le t} \frac{n_l - 1}{n_l + 1} \prod_{m=1}^{t} (n_m + 1). \tag{12}$$

What we have proved in Theorem 2 implies that there exists a bijection between $\mathfrak{E}_p$ and $\mathcal{G}_p$, and so $E \cap S_p$ as listed in (9), (10) and (11) are precisely all the members of $\mathcal{G}_p$, and so $|\mathcal{G}_p| = |\mathfrak{E}_p|$.

Remark When $p = \{\mathcal{N}\}$, the first term of the right hand side of (12) is 1, the second term vanishes and the last term is $n-1$, and so $|\mathfrak{E}_p| = n$ as we discussed in Example 1. When $p = \{\{i\} : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$, the first term of the right hand side of (12) is n, the second term is $\binom{n}{2}2^{n-2}$ and the third term vanishes. Therefore, $|\mathfrak{E}_p| = n + \binom{n}{2}2^{n-2}$, which is equal to $|\mathcal{E}_n|$, the number of facets of Γ_n [3, (14.2)]. In this case, $\Psi_p = \Gamma_n$, so $|\mathcal{E}_n| = |\mathcal{G}_p|$ and by Theorem 2, $|\mathcal{G}_p| = |\mathfrak{E}_p|$. For $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$, when $t \ll n$, it can be seen from (12) that $|\mathfrak{E}_p| \ll |\mathcal{E}_n|$, and then by Theorem 2, $|\mathcal{G}_p| \ll |\mathcal{E}_n|$. Therefore, for an information theory problem with symmetrical structures induced by such a partition p, the complexity of this problem can be significantly reduced.

By Theorem 2, we denote the facets of Ψ_p by $G_p([\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}])$ and thus $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) : \lambda \in \mathfrak{N}_p\}$. Specifically,

$$G_p([\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]) = E(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K}) \cap S_p$$

$$= \begin{cases} G_p([\mathbf{1}_t(l), \mathbf{0}_t]) = E(i) \cap S_p, \text{ if } \mathcal{I} = \{i\}, \mathcal{K} = \emptyset, \ i \in \mathcal{N}_l, \ l = 1, \cdots, t \\ G_p([\mathbf{1}_t(l_1, l_2), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]) = E(ij, \mathcal{K}) \cap S_p, \text{ if } \mathcal{I} = \{i, j\}, \ i \in \mathcal{N}_{l_1}, j \in \mathcal{N}_{l_2}, 1 \le l_1 < l_2 \le t, \\ G_p([\mathbf{2}_t(l), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}]) = E(ij, \mathcal{K}) \cap S_p, \text{ if } \mathcal{I} = \{i, j\}, \ i, j \in \mathcal{N}_l, \ l = 1, \cdots, t. \end{cases}$$

Remark For certain sets of parameters, the condition that guarantees the existence of the facets in $\mathcal{G}_p$ may not hold. For example, if $|\mathcal{N}_1| = 1$, then $G_p([\mathbf{2}_t(1), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K},p}])$ does not exist. For such cases, the facets discussed above do not need to be considered for the chosen set of parameters.

For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_{t,n}$, define $\psi_p : \mathcal{H}_n \to \mathcal{H}_n$ as follows. For any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$,

$$\psi_p(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{A}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t} \binom{n_i}{a_i} \right)^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{B}:\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}} \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}).$$

where $a_i \triangleq \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}(i) = |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|, i = 1, \cdots, t$. It can be shown that ψ_p is a surjection from $\mathcal{H}_n$ onto S_p. This is because it can be checked that for any $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$, $\psi_p(\mathbf{h}) \in S_p$, and for any $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$, $\mathbf{h} = \psi_p(\mathbf{h})$.

Theorem 3: For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$,

$$\psi_p(\mathbf{h}) = \frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} \sigma(\mathbf{h}).$$

Proof: Let $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}_t\}$. By definition, as discussed above, Σ_p is a group with composition as its group operation, which is a subgroup of the symmetrical group Σ_n and $|\Sigma_p| = \prod_{i=1}^{t} n_i!$. For a fixed $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, define

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p} = \{\sigma \in \Sigma_p : \sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}\}.$$

It can be checked that $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}$ is a subgroup of Σ_p. Since for $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, $\sigma_i(j) = j$ for all $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i, i = 1, \cdots, t$ according to (3), we have $|\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}| = \prod_{i=1}^{t} a_i!(n_i - a_i)!$. Furthermore, for any $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}$,

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p} \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma_p : \sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}\}$$

is a left coset of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}$ in Σ_p. To see this, let $\sigma_b \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}$. Then it is routine to check that the mapping $f : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p} \to \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}$ defined by $f(\sigma) = \sigma_b \circ \sigma$ is a bijection. Therefore,

$$|\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}| = |\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}| = \prod_i^t a_i!(n_i - a_i)!. \tag{13}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_p}\sigma(\mathbf{h})\right)(\mathcal{A}) =& \frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_p}\sigma(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{A}) && (14)\\
=& \frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_p}\mathbf{h}(\sigma(\mathcal{A})) && (15)\\
=& \frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\mathcal{B}:\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}=\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}}\ \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}}\mathbf{h}(\sigma(\mathcal{A})) && (16)\\
=& \frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\mathcal{B}:\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}=\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}}|\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}|\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})\\
=& \frac{|\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}|}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}}\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})\\
=& \frac{|\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}|}{|\Sigma_p|}\sum_{\mathcal{B}:\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}=\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}}\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) && (17)\\
=& \frac{\prod_i^t a_i!(n_i-a_i)!}{\prod_{i=1}^t n_i!}\sum_{\mathcal{B}:\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}=\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}}\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) && (18)\\
=& \left(\prod_{i=1}^t\binom{n_i}{a_i}\right)^{-1}\sum_{\mathcal{B}:\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{B},p}=\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{A},p}}\mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B})\\
=& \psi_p(\mathbf{h})(\mathcal{A}),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the theorem. Equation (14) is valid since the summation is component-wise. Equation (15) is due to (4). For (16), we partition Σ_p into cosets $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A},p}$ of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A},p}$. Equations (17) and (18) are due to (13). ■

Therefore, we have proved that $\psi_p(\mathbf{h})$ is the average of all $\sigma(\mathbf{h})$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, i.e., all elements in $\mathcal{O}_p(\mathbf{h})$.

Lemma 7: If $T \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ is p-invariant and convex, $\psi_p(T) = T \cap S_p$.

Proof: Since T is p-invariant and convex, $\psi_p(T) \subset T$ and so $\psi_p(T) \subset T \cap S_p$. On the other hand, for any $\mathbf{s} \in T \cap S_p$, $\mathbf{s} = \psi_p(\mathbf{s}) \in \psi_p(T)$ which implies that $\psi_p(T) \supset T \cap S_p$. ■

So, $\psi_p(\Gamma_p) = \Psi_p$ and $\psi_p(\overline{\Gamma_n^*}) = \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p$. In particular, if $T = \{\mathbf{h}\}$ for some $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n$ which is p-invariant, $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$ by Proposition 9, then $\psi_p(\mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{h}$. On the other hand, again by Proposition 9, for any $\mathbf{h} \in S_p$, $\psi_p(\mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{h}$.

Theorem 4: For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$,

$$\overline{\Psi_p^*} = \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p.$$

Proof: Toward proving this theorem, we first prove that

$$\overline{\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)} = \overline{\Gamma_n^*}. \tag{19}$$

By [14, Theorem 1], $\mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*}) \subset \Gamma_n^*$. Since $\mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ is open, $\mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*}) \subset \mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*) \subset \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$. Thus $\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*) = \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$. Taking the closure of the both sides, we have $\overline{\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)} = \overline{\mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})}$. Hence $\overline{\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)} = \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ by [29, Theorem 6.3].

Now we prove Theorem 4. Since $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p \supset \Gamma_n^* \cap S_p$, by taking the closure of both sides, we have $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p \supset \overline{\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p}$. Then it suffices to prove $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p \subset \overline{\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p}$, or for any $\mathbf{h} \in \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p$, $\mathbf{h} \in \overline{\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p}$. Let $\mathrm{B}(c, r)$ denote an open ball centered at c with radius r. Given any $\epsilon > 0$, let $B = \mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h}, \epsilon) \cap \mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)$. Since $\mathbf{h} \in \overline{\Gamma_n^*} = \overline{\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)}$ by (19), $B \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathbf{g} \in B$. Then there exits a set of random variables $X_{\mathcal{N}}$ whose entropy function is $\mathbf{g}$. Then for $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, $\sigma(\mathbf{g})$ is the entropy function of $X'_{\mathcal{N}} \triangleq \{X'_i = X_{\sigma(i)} : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$. Since $\mathbf{h} \in S_n$, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, $\|\mathbf{h} - \sigma(\mathbf{g})\|_2 = \|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{g}\|_2 < \epsilon$, i.e., $\sigma(\mathbf{g}) \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h}, \epsilon)$. Let $\mathbf{h}^* = \frac{1}{|\Sigma_p|} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} \sigma(\mathbf{g})$. Note that $\mathbf{h}^* = \psi_p(\mathbf{h}) \in S_p$. Due to the convexity of $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h}, \epsilon)$ and $\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)$, we have $\mathbf{h}^* \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h}, \epsilon) \cap \mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*)$. Hence $\mathbf{h}^* \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h}, \epsilon) \cap \mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*) \cap S_p$, that is, $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{h}, \epsilon) \cap \mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*) \cap S_p \neq \emptyset$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, which implies $\mathbf{h} \in \overline{\mathrm{ri}(\Gamma_n^*) \cap S_p} \subset \overline{\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p}$. Therefore $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p \subset \overline{\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p}$. ■

Then Theorem 4 implies that $\psi_p(\overline{\Gamma_n^*}) = \overline{\Psi_p^*}$.

For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, ψ_p is linear by Theorem 3 and so continuous. Hence $\overline{\psi_p(\Gamma_n^*)} = \psi_p(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$. By Lemma 7, $\psi_p(\overline{\Gamma_n^*}) = \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_p$. Together with Theorem 4, we have $\overline{\psi_p(\Gamma_n^*)} = \overline{\Gamma_n^* \cap S_p} = \overline{\Psi_p^*}$.

Remark: As $\dim \overline{\Gamma_n^*} = \dim \mathcal{H}_n^0 = \dim S^0_{\{\{i\}, i \in \mathcal{N}\}}$, then $\dim S_p^0 < \dim \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ for all $p \neq \{\{i\}, i \in \mathcal{N}\}$ by Proposition 11. By [29, Theorem 6.2], $\dim \overline{\Gamma_n^*} = \dim \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ which implies $\dim S_p^0 < \dim \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$. Hence there exists $\mathbf{h} \in \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ such that $\mathbf{h} \notin S_p^0$ and for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, $\sigma(\mathbf{h}) \notin S_p^0$ by Proposition 9. As $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is p-invariant and so is $\mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ which implies $\sigma(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$. Then $\psi_p(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ as $\mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ is convex. Furthermore, $\psi_p(\mathbf{h}) \in S_p^0$ by the definition of ψ_p. Therefore, $S_p^0 \cap \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*}) \neq \emptyset$ and there exists $\mathbf{h} \in \mathrm{ri}(\overline{\Gamma_n^*})$ such that $\sigma(\mathbf{h}) \notin$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$. So we say S_p^0 'cuts through' $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ if $p \neq \{\{i\}, i \in \mathcal{N}\}$. ■

V. Partition-symmetrical entropy functions

A. One-partition-symmetrical entropy functions

In this subsection, we consider $\mathcal{P}_{1,n} = \mathcal{P}_{1,n}^*$ which consists of the partition $p = [n]$. When $p = [n]$, (6) becomes

$$S_n = \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) \text{ if } |\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{B}|,\ \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}\}. \tag{20}$$

Theorem 5:

$$\overline{\Psi_n^*} = \Psi_n.$$

By Theorem 2 and Example 1, the family of facets of Ψ_n is given by $\mathcal{G}_n = \{G_n(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) : \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{N}_n\}$, where $\mathfrak{N}_n = \{[(1), (0)]\} \cup \{[(2), (k)] : k = 0, \cdots, n-2\}$. For notational convenience, let $G_n^n = G_n([(1), (0)])$ and $G_k^n = G_n([(2), (k-1)]), k \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{n\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}_n = \{G_k^n : k \in \mathcal{N}\}$. According to (9) and (11), we see that

$$G_k^n = \{\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_n :\ 2s_k = s_{k-1} + s_{k+1},\}$$

for $k \in \mathcal{N}$, where $s_{n+1} \triangleq s_n$ for notational convenience. Then

$$\Psi_n = \Gamma_n \cap S_n = \{\mathbf{h} \in S_n : 2s_k \geq s_{k-1} + s_{k+1}, k \in \mathcal{N}\}. \tag{21}$$

For a fixed n, let $R_{m,n}$ be the ray originated from the origin that contains the uniform matroid $U_{m,n}$, $m \in \mathcal{N}$.

Theorem 6: The set of rays $\{R_{m,n} : m \in \mathcal{N}\}$ are all the extreme rays of Ψ_n.

Proof: We first prove that for all $m \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$R_{m,n} = \bigcap_{k \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{m\}} G_k^n. \tag{22}$$

It is straightforward to verify that $R_{m,n}$ is a subset of the right hand side above. Now we prove the inclusion in the other direction. For a fixed $m \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathbf{h} \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{m\}} G_k^n$, $\mathbf{h}$ is in $n-1$ facets of Ψ_n, i.e., $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}, [n])$ satisfies all the n inequalities in (21) with equality except for $k = m$. With this set of $n-1$ inequalities, we have $s_k = s_1 \min\{k, m\}$. Together with the inequality in (21) for $k = m$, we have $s_1 \geq 0$. Therefore, $\mathbf{h} = s_1 U_{m,n} \in R_{m,n}$. It follows from (22) that for $m \in \mathcal{N}$, $R_{m,n}$ is a face and hence an extreme ray of Ψ_n.

Since Ψ_n is an n-dimensional polyhedral cone, an extreme ray of Ψ_n can be expressed as the intersection of $n-1$ facets of Ψ_n, i.e., $R_{m,n}$ for some $m \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus we have shown that an extreme ray of Ψ_n has the form (22). The theorem is proved. ■

Corollary 1:

$$\Psi_n = \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_n$$

Proof: Since $\overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_n \subset \Gamma_n \cap S_n = \Psi_n$, it suffices to prove that $\Psi_n \subset \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_n$. It follows from the definition of Ψ_n that $\Psi_n \subset S_n$, so we only need to prove $\Psi_n \subset \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$. Toward this end, observe that the uniform matroids $U_{m,n}, m \in \mathcal{N}$ are representable, and so they are almost entropic by Proposition 5 . Furthermore, $R_{m,n}, m \in \mathcal{N}$ are almost entropic because $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is a convex cone. Since $\{R_{m,n} : m \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is the set of all the extreme rays of Ψ_n by Theorem 6, for any $\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_n$, it is the convex combination of some polymatroids on these extreme rays and thus almost entropic, which implies $\Psi_n \subset \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \cap S_n$. ■

Then Theorem 5 follows immediately from Corollary 1 and Theorem 4.

Remark Corollary 1 is equivalent to [38, Theorem 4.1] which was rediscovered in [39]. [38, Theorem 4.1] and [39] obtained the results similar to Theorem 6 by Vandermonde matrix and Reed-Solomon codes respectively and then derived the statements which are equivalent to Corollary 1.

B. Two-partition-symmetrical entropy functions

In this subsection, we discuss the characterization of two-partition symmetrical entropy function regions, i.e., p-symmetrical entropy function regions for $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}$. For representative $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}^*$, i.e., $p = [1, n-1], [2, n-2], \cdots, [\lfloor n/2 \rfloor, n - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor]$, we prove that $\overline{\Psi_p^*} = \Psi_p$ if and only if $p = [1, n-1]$.

For $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2\} \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}$, (6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_p = &\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n : \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{B}) \\ &\text{if } |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{N}_i| = |\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{N}_i|,\ \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}, i = 1, 2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Similar to the one-partition case, by (9)-(11), we obtain the p-symmetrical polymatroidal region

$$\Psi_p = \{\mathbf{h} \in S_p : s_{n_1, n_2} \geq s_{n_1 - 1, n_2},$$

$$s_{n_1,n_2} \geq s_{n_1,n_2-1},$$

$$2s_{k_1,k_2} \geq s_{k_1-1,k_2} + s_{k_1+1,k_2}, \quad 1 \leq k_1 \leq n_1 - 1, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n_2,$$

$$s_{k_1,k_2-1} + s_{k_1-1,k_2} \geq s_{k_1-1,k_2-1} + s_{k_1,k_2}, \quad 1 \leq k_1 \leq n_1, 1 \leq k_2 \leq n_2,$$

$$2s_{k_1,k_2} \geq s_{k_1,k_2-1} + s_{k_1,k_2+1}, \quad 0 \leq k_1 \leq n_1, 1 \leq k_2 \leq n_2 - 1.\}$$

In Subsection V-B1 below, we first discuss the case $p = [1, n-1]$. In the Subsection V-B2 then the other cases.

1) $p = [1, n-1]$: The $[1, n-1]$-symmetrical problem can be treated in similar steps as we dealt with the one-partition-symmetrical entropy function region in the last section.

Theorem 7:

$$\overline{\Psi^*_{1,n-1}} = \Psi_{1,n-1}.$$

Similar to the last section in discussion for the one-partition case, we obtain

$$\Psi_{1,n-1} = \{\mathbf{h} \in S_{1,n-1} : s_{1,n-1} \geq s_{1,n-2}, \tag{24}$$

$$s_{1,n-1} \geq s_{0,n-1}, \tag{25}$$

$$s_{1,j-1} + s_{0,j} \geq s_{0,j-1} + s_{1,j}, \ 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \tag{26}$$

$$2s_{i,j} \geq s_{i,j-1} + s_{i,j+1}, i = 0, 1, 1 \leq j \leq n-2\}. \tag{27}$$

Theorem 8: For $n \geq 2$, the set of all extreme rays of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$ are the rays containing the polymatroids

$$U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}, \tag{28}$$

$$U^n_{1,n-1}, \cdots, U^n_{n-1,n-1}, \tag{29}$$

$$U^n_{1,n}, \cdots, U^n_{n-1,n}, \tag{30}$$

$$U^n_{2,n+1}, \cdots, U^n_{n-1,n+1}, \tag{31}$$

$$\cdots, \tag{32}$$

$$U^n_{n-2,2n-3}, U^n_{n-1,2n-3}, \tag{33}$$

$$U^n_{n-1,2n-2} \tag{34}$$

to be defined next.

In (28), $U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}$ is the matroid with ground set $\mathcal{N}$ which has submatroid $U_{1,1}$ on $\{1\}$ and loops $2, \cdots, n$. Specifically, for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}(\mathcal{A}) = |\{1\} \cap \mathcal{A}|$. Note that $U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1} \in S_{1,n-1}$ and for $(u_{j_1,j_2})_{(j_1,j_2)\in\mathcal{N}_{1,n-1}} \triangleq \mathbf{s}(U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}, [1, n-1])$,

$$u_{j_1,j_2} = j_1. \tag{35}$$

In (29)-(34), for $n-1 \leq m \leq 2n-2$ and $\max\{1, m-n+1\} \leq k \leq n-1$, $U^n_{k,m}$ denotes an integer-valued polymatroid with ground set $\mathcal{N}$ which is the factor of the uniform matroid $U_{k,m}$ under $\phi_{m,n} : \mathcal{N} \to 2^{\mathcal{M}}$ with

$\mathcal{M} = \{1, \cdots, m\}$ defined as follow:

$$\phi_{m,n}(i) = \begin{cases} \{1, \cdots, m-n+1\}, & \text{if } i = 1, \\ \{i+m-n\}, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{1\}. \end{cases}$$

It can be seen that $U^n_{k,m}(\mathcal{A}) = \min\{k, |\phi_{m,n}(\mathcal{A})|\}$ for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$ and $U^n_{k,m} \in S_{1,n-1}$. Then for $(u_{j_1,j_2})_{(j_1,j_2)\in\mathcal{N}_{1,n-1}} \triangleq \mathbf{s}(U^n_{k,m}, [1, n-1])$,

$$u_{j_1,j_2} = \min\{k, (m-n+1)j_1 + j_2\}. \tag{36}$$

Note that when $m = n-1$, $\phi_{m,n}(1) = \emptyset$ and $U^n_{k,m}$ is the matroid which has submatroid $U_{k,n-1}$ on $\{2, \cdots, n\}$ and loop 1; when $m = n$, $U^n_{k,m}$ coincides with the uniform matroid $U_{k,n}$.

The set of all polymatroids in (28)-(34) is denoted by $\mathcal{U}_n$. We use R in place of U to denote the ray containing the corresponding polymatroids, i.e., $R^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}$ is the ray containing $U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}$ and $R^n_{k,m}$ is the ray containing $U^n_{k,m}$. The set of all rays containing the polymatroids in $\mathcal{U}_n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{R}_n$.

Lemma 8: For $n \geq 2$, any ray $R \in \mathcal{R}_n$ is an extreme ray of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$.

Proof: The proof of this lemma is similar to the first part of the poof of Theorem 6. To prove this lemma, it suffices to prove that any $R \in \mathcal{R}_n$ is a face of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$. Let $\mathcal{G}(R) = \{G \in \mathcal{G}_{1,n-1} : R \subset G\}$. Specifically, we will prove that

$$R = \bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}(R)} G, \tag{37}$$

where the right hand side above is a face of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$ (cf. Proposition 2) which by definition contains R.

We now prove that $\bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}(R)} G$, the right hand side of (37), is a subset of R. Since $\bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}(R)} G$ is a face of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$, we only need to prove that it is 1-dimensional to conclude that R is an extreme ray of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$. Toward this end, for a specific R, we will consider a suitably chosen subset $\mathcal{G}'(R)$ of $\mathcal{G}(R)$ such that $\bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}'(R)} G$ is 1-dimensional. It then follows that $\bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}(R)} G$ is also 1-dimensional because $R \subset \bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}(R)} G \subset \bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}'(R)} G$.

First, we consider $R^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}$. It can be checked that (35) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 2u_{j_1,j_2+1} &= u_{j_1,j_2} + u_{j_1,j_2+2}, \quad j_1 = 0, 1, \text{ and } j_2 = 0, \cdots, n-3, \\ u_{1,n-1} &= u_{1,n-2}, \\ u_{1,1} &= u_{1,0} + u_{0,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $R^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}$ is contained in the following three types of facets with the respective constraints.

- $G_{[1,n-1]}([(0,2),(j_1,j_2)],\ j_1 = 0, 1, \text{ and } j_2 = 0, \cdots, n-3$ (cf. (11)):

$$2s_{j_1,j_2+1} = s_{j_1,j_2} + s_{j_1,j_2+2}; \tag{38}$$

- $G_{[1,n-1]}([(0,1),(0,0)])$ (cf. (9)):

$$s_{1,n-1} = s_{1,n-2}; \tag{39}$$

- $G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,1),(0,0)])$ (cf. (10)):

$$s_{1,1} = s_{1,0} + s_{0,1}. \tag{40}$$

Let $\mathcal{G}'(R_{1,1}^{\{1\},n})$ be the set of all the above facets, and we now prove that $\bigcap_{G\in\mathcal{G}'(R_{1,1}^{\{1\},n})} G$ is 1-dimensional. By setting $j_1 = 1$ in (38) and (39), we can show by induction that $s_{1,n-1} = s_{1,n-2} = \cdots = s_{1,0}$, or

$$s_{1,j_2} = s_{1,0}, \quad j_2 = 1, \cdots, n-1. \tag{41}$$

Since $s_{1,1} = s_{1,0}$, together with (40), we have

$$s_{0,1} = 0. \tag{42}$$

Using (38) for $j_1 = 0$, (42), and the fact that $s_{0,0} = \mathbf{h}(\emptyset) = 0$, , we can show by induction that

$$s_{0,j_2} = 0, \quad j_2 = 1, \cdots, n-1. \tag{43}$$

Finally, by combining (41) and (43), we have

$$s_{j_1,j_2} = s_{1,0} j_1, \quad (j_1, j_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{1,n-1},$$

which implies that the right hand side of (37) is 1-dimensional and so (37) is valid for $R = R_{1,1}^{\{1\},n}$.

For $R_{k,m}^n$, we prove (37) in the same way as we have proved the case for $R_{1,1}^{\{1\},n}$. For the convenience of discussion, we will specify the elements of $\mathcal{G}'(R_{k,m}^n)$ as we progress. Let $\mathcal{N}' = \{1, \cdots, n-1\}$. We first consider the facets and the face (an intersection of two facets) below which contain $R_{k,m}^n$ for particular values of the indices (depending on the values of k and m):

- $G_{j_1,j_2}^n \triangleq G_{[1,n-1]}([(0,2),(j_1,j_2-1)])$, $j_1 = 0,1$ and $j_2 = 1, \cdots, n-2$ (cf. (11)):

$$2s_{j_1,j_2} = s_{j_1,j_2-1} + s_{j_1,j_2+1}; \tag{44}$$

- $G_{0,n-1}^n \triangleq G_{[1,n-1]}([(0,1),(0,0)]) \cap G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,1),(0,n-2)])$ (cf. (9),(10)):

$$s_{0,n-1} = s_{0,n-2}; \tag{45}$$

- $G_{1,n-1}^n \triangleq G_{[1,n-1]}([(0,1),(0,0)])$ (cf. (9)):

$$s_{1,n-1} = s_{1,n-2}; \tag{46}$$

- $G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,0),(0,0)])$ (cf. (9)):

$$s_{1,n-1} = s_{0,n-1}; \tag{47}$$

- $G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,1),(0,0)])$(cf. (10)):

$$s_{1,1} = s_{0,1} + s_{1,0}. \tag{48}$$

Using (36), it can be checked that $R_{k,m}^n \subset \bigcap_{j_1\in\mathcal{N}', j_2\neq k} G_{0,j_2}$. By letting $s_{0,n} = s_{0,n-1}$, we can combine (44) for $j_1 = 0$ and (45) to obtain

$$2s_{0,j_2} = s_{0,j_2-1} + s_{0,j_2+1}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}',\ j_2 \neq k.$$

Using the same argument in the proof of Theorem 6, we can show that

$$s_{0,j_2} = s_{0,1} \min\{k, j_2\}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'. \tag{49}$$

- If $k = m - n + 1$, by (36), $R^n_{k,m} \subset \bigcap_{j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'} G^n_{1,j_2}$. By letting $s_{1,n} = s_{1,n-1}$, we can combine (44) for $j_1 = 1$ and (46) to obtain

$$2s_{1,j_2} = s_{1,j_2-1} + s_{1,j_2+1}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'.$$

Then we can show by induction that $s_{1,n-1} = s_{1,n-2} = \cdots = s_{1,0}$, or

$$s_{1,j_2} = s_{1,n-1}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'. \tag{50}$$

Consider (49) for $j_2 = n - 1$. Since $k \leq n - 1$,

$$s_{0,n-1} = k s_{0,1}. \tag{51}$$

Since $R^n_{k,m} \subset G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,0),(0,0)])$, we have (47). Together with (51),

$$s_{1,n-1} = k s_{0,1}. \tag{52}$$

Then by (52) and (50),

$$s_{1,j_2} = k s_{0,1}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'. \tag{53}$$

Combining (49) and (53), we have

$$s_{j_1,j_2} = s_{0,1} \min\{k, j_1 k + j_2\}, \quad (j_1, j_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{1,n-1}. \tag{54}$$

- If $k > m - n + 1$, by (36), $R^n_{k,m} \subset \bigcap_{j_2 \in \mathcal{N}', j_2 \neq k+n-m-1} G^n_{1,j_2}$. By letting $s_{1,n} = s_{1,n-1}$, we can combine (44) for $j_1 = 1$ and (46) to obtain

$$2s_{1,j_2} = s_{1,j_2-1} + s_{1,j_2+1}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}',\ j_2 \neq k + n - m - 1,$$

Note that $R^n_{k,m} \subset G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,1),(0,0)])$. Using the argument in the proof of Theorem 6, together with (48), we can show that

$$s_{1,j_2} = s_{1,0} + s_{0,1} \min\{k + n - m - 1, j_2\}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'. \tag{55}$$

Consider (55) for $j_2 = n - 1$. Since $k \leq n - 1 \leq m$, we have

$$s_{1,n-1} = s_{1,0} + s_{0,1}(k + n - m - 1). \tag{56}$$

Since $R^n_{k,m} \subset G_{[1,n-1]}([(1,0),(0,0)])$, we have (47). Together with (56),

$$s_{0,n-1} = s_{1,0} + s_{0,1}(k + n - m - 1). \tag{57}$$

By (51) and (57), we have $s_{1,0} = s_{0,1}(m - n + 1)$, and so by (55),

$$s_{1,j_2} = s_{0,1} \min\{k, m - n + 1 + j_2\}, \quad j_2 \in \mathcal{N}'. \tag{58}$$

Combining (49) and (58), we have

$$s_{j_1,j_2} = s_{0,1}(m - n + 1) j_1 + s_{0,1} \min\{k + (n - m - 1) j_1, j_2\}, \quad (j_1, j_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{1,n-1}. \tag{59}$$

It can be seen that both (54) and (59) can be written as

$$s_{j_1,j_2} = s_{0,1} \min\{k, (m-n+1)j_1 + j_2\}, \quad (j_1, j_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{1,n-1},$$

which implies that the right hand side of (37) is 1-dimensional and then (37) is valid for $R = R^n_{k,m}$.

■

Lemma 9: For $n \geq 2$, $\mathcal{R}_n$ contains all the extreme rays of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$.

Proof It can be readily checked that $\mathcal{R}_2$ contains all the extreme rays of $\Psi_{1,1}$. So it suffices to prove that if $\mathcal{R}_n$ contains all the extreme rays of $\Psi_{1,n-1}$, then $\mathcal{R}_{n+1}$ contains all the extreme rays of $\Psi_{1,n}$. To this end, we will prove that for an arbitrary $\mathbf{h}_{n+1} \in \Psi_{1,n}$, it can be written as a conic combination of the polymatroids in $\mathcal{U}_{n+1}$.

Consider $\mathbf{h}_n \in \Psi_{1,n-1}$. Let $\mathbf{s}_n \triangleq (s_{j_1,j_2})_{(j_1,j_2)\in\mathcal{N}_{1,n-1}} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}_n, [1, n-1])$. Let $\mathbf{h}_{n+1} \in \Psi_{1,n}$ such that $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{h}_{n+1}, [1, n]) = \mathbf{s}_{n+1} \triangleq (s_{j_1,j_2})_{(j_1,j_2)\in\mathcal{N}_{1,n}}$, i.e., $\mathbf{s}_{n+1}$ contains $\mathbf{s}_n$ as a subvector with two additional entries $s_{0,n}$ and $s_{1,n}$. These two entries satisfy the following five constraints:

$$s_{1,n} \geq s_{1,n-1}, \tag{60}$$

$$s_{1,n} \geq s_{0,n}, \tag{61}$$

$$s_{1,n-1} + s_{0,n} \geq s_{0,n-1} + s_{1,n}, \tag{62}$$

$$2s_{1,n-1} \geq s_{1,n-2} + s_{1,n}, \tag{63}$$

$$2s_{0,n-1} \geq s_{0,n-2} + s_{0,n}, \tag{64}$$

which can be rewritten as

$$s_{1,n-1} \leq s_{1,n} \leq 2s_{1,n-1} - s_{1,n-2}, \tag{65}$$

$$s_{1,n} - s_{1,1-n} + s_{0,n-1} \leq s_{0,n} \leq \min\{s_{1,n}, 2s_{0,n-1} - s_{0,n-2}\}, \tag{66}$$

or

$$s_{1,n} = s_{1,n-1} + e_1, \tag{67}$$

$$s_{0,n} = s_{0,n-1} + e_1 + e_2, \tag{68}$$

where $0 \leq e_1 \leq s_{1,n-1} - s_{1,n-2}$ and $0 \leq e_2 \leq \min\{s_{1,1-n} - s_{0,n-1}, s_{0,n-1} - s_{0,n-2} - e_1\}$ which can be seen by substituting (67) into (66). Then $L \triangleq (s_{1,n-1} - s_{1,n-2}, s_{1,1-n} - s_{0,n-1}, s_{0,n-1} - s_{0,n-2})$ bounds the range of auxiliary variables e_1, e_2, where the first component is the upper bound of e_1 and the second and third components together with e_1 define the upper bound on e_2. If $\mathbf{s}_n \in \mathcal{U}_n$, the entries of L can only be 0 or 1. We classify the members of $\mathcal{U}_n$ into four classes according to L as follow.

1) $L = (0, 1, 0)$, $\mathcal{A} = \{U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}\}$,
2) $L = (1, 0, 1)$, $\mathcal{B} = \{U^n_{n-1,n-1}\}$,
3) $L = (0, 0, 1)$, $\mathcal{C} = \{U^n_{n-1,m} : n \leq m \leq 2n-2\}$,
4) $L = (0, 0, 0)$, $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n \setminus (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C})$.

These can be verified from (35) and (36).

For $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{n+1} \in \mathbf{s}(\Psi_{1,n},[1,n])$ with subvector $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_n \in \mathbf{s}(\Psi_{1,n-1},[1,n-1])$ and two additional entries $\tilde{s}_{0,n},\tilde{s}_{1,n}$, we write it as $(\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_n,\tilde{s}_{0,n},\tilde{s}_{1,n})$. For

$$\mathbf{h}_n = a\mathbf{u}_A + b\mathbf{u}_B + \sum_{\mathbf{u}_C\in\mathcal{C}} c_{\mathbf{u}_C}\mathbf{u}_C + \sum_{\mathbf{u}_D\in\mathcal{D}} d_{\mathbf{u}_D}\mathbf{u}_D,$$

where $\mathbf{u}_A \in \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{u}_B \in \mathcal{B}$, $a,b,c_{\mathbf{u}_C},d_{\mathbf{u}_D} \geq 0$, and $s_{1,n} = s_{1,n-1}+e_1, s_{0,n} = s_{0,n-1}+e_1+e_2$, it can be checked that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{s}_{n+1} = {} & (a-e_2)(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_A,[1,n-1]),0,1) \\
& + \left(b-e_1-e_2+\sum_{\mathbf{u}_C\in\mathcal{C}} c'_{\mathbf{u}_C}\right)(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_B,[1,n-1]),n-1,n-1) \\
& + e_1(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_B,[1,n-1]),n,n) \\
& + \left(e_2-\sum_{\mathbf{u}_C\in\mathcal{C}} c'_{\mathbf{u}_C}\right)(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_A+\mathbf{u}_B,[1,n-1]),n,n) \\
& + \sum_{\mathbf{u}_C\in\mathcal{C}} (c_{\mathbf{u}_C}-c'_{\mathbf{u}_C})(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_C,[1,n-1]),n-1,n-1) \\
& + \sum_{\mathbf{u}_C\in\mathcal{C}} c'_{\mathbf{u}_C}(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_A+\mathbf{u}_C,[1,n-1]),n,n) \\
& + \sum_{\mathbf{u}_D\in\mathcal{D}} d_{\mathbf{u}_D}(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_D,[1,n-1]),k_{\mathbf{u}_D},k_{\mathbf{u}_D}),
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where $0 \leq c'_{\mathbf{u}_C} \leq \min\{c_{\mathbf{u}_C},e_2\}$ and $\sum c'_{\mathbf{u}_C} \geq e_1+e_2$. For $\mathbf{u}_A = U^{\{1\},n}_{1,1}$, $\mathbf{u}_B = U^n_{n-1,n-1}$, $\mathbf{u}_C = U^n_{n-1,m_{\mathbf{u}_C}}$ and $\mathbf{u}_D = U^n_{k_{\mathbf{u}_D},m_{\mathbf{u}_D}}$. It can be checked that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_A,[1,n-1]),0,1) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{\{1\},n+1}_{1,1},[1,n]), \\
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_B,[1,n-1]),n-1,n-1) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{n+1}_{n-1,n},[1,n]), \\
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_B,[1,n-1]),n,n) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{n+1}_{n,n},[1,n]), \\
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_A+\mathbf{u}_B,[1,n]),n,n) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{n+1}_{n,n+1},[1,n]), \\
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_C,[1,n-1]),n-1,n-1) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{n+1}_{n-1,m_{\mathbf{u}_C}+1},[1,n]), \\
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_A+\mathbf{u}_C,[1,n]),n,n) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{n+1}_{n,,m_{\mathbf{u}_C}+1},[1,n]), \\
(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{u}_D),k_{\mathbf{u}_D},m_{\mathbf{u}_D}) &= \mathbf{s}(U^{n+1}_{k_{\mathbf{u}_D},m_{\mathbf{u}_D}+1},[1,n]).
\end{aligned}$$

Then by taking s^{-1} on both sides of (69), $\mathbf{h}_{n+1}$ is a conic combination of polymatroids in $\mathcal{U}_{n+1}$.

By exhausting all $\mathbf{h}_n \in \Psi_{1,n-1}$ and possible e_1,e_2, we can write an arbitrary $\mathbf{h}_{n+1} \in \Psi_{1,n}$ as a conic combination of the polymatroids in $\mathcal{U}_{n+1}$, which implies that there exit no other extreme rays of $\Psi_{1,n}$. ■

Then Theorem 8 is proved. Together with Proposition 6, we obtain

Corollary 2:

$$\Psi_{1,n-1} = \overline{\Gamma^*_n} \cap S_{1,n-1}.$$

Then Theorem 7 follows from Corollary 2 and Theorem 4.

2) $p = [n_1, n_2]$ with $n_1, n_2 \geq 2$: Consider $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathcal{H}_4^0$, where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathcal{A}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 1, \\ 3 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 2 \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \neq \{1,2\}, \\ 4 & \text{if } \mathcal{A} = \{1,2\} \text{ or } |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3. \end{cases} \tag{70}$$

It can be checked that $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \Gamma_4$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \in S_{2,2}$, so $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \Psi_{2,2}$. On the other hand, $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$ violates the Zhang-Yeung inequality [7] which implies that $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \notin \overline{\Gamma_4^*}$, and so $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \notin \overline{\Psi_{2,2}^*}$. It follows that

$$\overline{\Psi_{2,2}^*} \subsetneq \Psi_{2,2}. \tag{71}$$

Remark The free expansion of $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$ is the Vámos matroid, a well-known non-representable matroid,.

Theorem 9: For any $p = [n_1, n_2] \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}^*$ such that $n_1, n_2 \geq 2$,

$$\overline{\Psi_{n_1,n_2}^*} \subsetneq \Psi_{n_1,n_2}.$$

Proof: Consider $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2} \in \mathcal{H}_n^0$, where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2}(\mathcal{A}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 1, \\ 3 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 2 \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \not\subset \mathcal{N}_1, \\ 4 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 2 \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}_1, \\ 4 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3. \end{cases} \tag{72}$$

It can be checked that $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2} \in \Gamma_n$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \in S_{n_1,n_2}$, so $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \Psi_{n_1,n_2}$. We claim that $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2} \notin \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$. Assume otherwise. Let $\mathcal{N}_i' \subset \mathcal{N}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ such that $|\mathcal{N}_i'| = 2$. Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}'$ be a polymatroid with ground set $\mathcal{N}_1' \cup \mathcal{N}_2'$ such that for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}_1' \cup \mathcal{N}_2'$,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}'(\mathcal{A}) = \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2}(\mathcal{A}).$$

Then

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}'(\mathcal{A}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 1, \\ 3 & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}| = 2 \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{N}_1' \\ 4 & \text{if } \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{N}_1' \text{ or } |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Since $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}'$ is the restriction of $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2}$ on $\mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}'$ is almost entropic. On the other hand, it is seen that $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}'$ is not almost entropic because it violates the Zhang-Yeung inequality (cf.(72)). This leads to a contradiction. . Therefore $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2} \notin \overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ and so $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_{n_1,n_2} \notin \overline{\Psi_{n_1,n_2}^*}$. Hence, $\overline{\Psi_{n_1,n_2}^*} \subsetneq \Psi_{n_1,n_2}$. ■

C. Multi-partition-symmetrical entropy functions

In this subsection, we consider the cases $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ with more than two partitions.

Theorem 10: For $n \geq 4, t \geq 3$ and any $p \in \mathcal{P}_{t,n}$, $\overline{\Psi_p^*} \subsetneq \Psi_p$.

Proof: When $n \geq 4, t \geq 3$, any $p \in \mathcal{P}_{t,n}$, there exists $p' \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}$ such that $p \leq p'$ and the cardinality of each block of p' is at least 2. Then by Proposition 11, $S_p \supset S_{p'}$ which implies that $\Psi_p \supset \Psi_{p'}$.

Now by Theorem 9, $\overline{\Psi^*_{p'}} \subsetneq \Psi_{p'}$, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_{p'}$ but $\mathbf{h} \notin \overline{\Psi^*_{p'}}$. Consider $\mathbf{h} \neq \overline{\Psi^*_{p'}} = \overline{\Gamma^*_n \cap S_{p'}} = \overline{\Gamma^*_p} \cap S_{p'}$ (cf. Theorem 4). Since $\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_{p'} = \Gamma_n \cap S_{p'}$ implies $\mathbf{h} \in S_{p'}$, we see that $\mathbf{h} \notin \overline{\Gamma^*_n}$ which in turen implies that $\mathbf{h} \notin \overline{\Gamma^*_p} \cap S_p = \overline{\Psi^*_p}$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_{p'} \subset \Psi_p$. Therefore $\mathbf{h} \in \Psi_p \setminus \overline{\Psi^*_p}$ or $\overline{\Psi^*_p} \subsetneq \Psi_p$. ■

VI. Discussion

We have proved in Theorem 1 , the main theorem, that $\overline{\Psi^*_p} = \Psi_p$ if and only if $p = [n]$ or $p = [1, n-1]$ for $p \in \mathcal{P}^*_n$, $n \geq 4$, i.e., $\overline{\Psi^*_p}$, s completely characterized by Shannon-type information inequalities if and only if p is the 1-partition or a 2-partition with one of its blocks being a singleton. For those $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $\overline{\Psi^*_p} = \Psi_p$, the characterization of $\overline{\Psi^*_p}$ is complete. However, further work is needed to characterize Ψ^*_p for those $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $\overline{\Psi^*_p} \subsetneq \Psi_p$. For example, Theorem 1 asserts that $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ together with $p = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}\}$ gives the smallest example for which $\overline{\Psi^*_p} \subsetneq \Psi_p$. Here, both $\overline{\Psi^*_p}$ and $\overline{\Gamma^*_4}$, where $\overline{\Psi^*_p} \subset \overline{\Gamma^*_4}$, cannot be completely characterized. Nevertheless, characterizing $\overline{\Psi^*_p}$ can be regarded as an intermediate step toward characterizing $\overline{\Gamma^*_4}$.

The characterizations of $\overline{\Psi^*_p}$ may also be helpful for tackling information theory problems with symmetrical structures.

In the definition of $\Psi^*_p = \Gamma^*_n \cap S_p$ and $\Psi_p = \Gamma_n \cap S_p$, the constraint S_p is the fixed set of a group action of a subgroup Σ_p of symmetric subgroup Σ_n induced by the partition p. For further research, we can also define for any subgroup Σ of Σ_n, the corresponding group action and its fixed set S_Σ, and then study whether $\overline{\Psi^*_\Sigma} = \Psi_\Sigma$, where $\Psi^*_\Sigma = \Gamma^*_n \cap S_\Sigma$ and $\Psi_\Sigma = \Gamma_n \cap S_\Sigma$.

Appendix: Proof of Lemma 4

For $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the set $\mathfrak{E}_p$ of all p-orbits of facets of Γ_n is a partition of $\mathcal{E}_n$, the set of all facets of Γ_n. Therefore, there exists a partial order on $\{\mathfrak{E}_p : p \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ as we discussed in Subsection II-C.

Lemma 10: For $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_n$, if $p \leq p'$, then $\mathfrak{E}_p \leq \mathfrak{E}_{p'}$.

Proof: To prove this lemma, it suffices to prove that two p-equivalent facets are p'-equivalent if $p \leq p'$. Let facets $E_i = E(\mathcal{I}_i, \mathcal{K}_i), i = 1, 2$ of Γ_n be p-equivalent. By Lemma 2, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2,p}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_1,p} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_2,p}$. Since $p \leq p'$, any entry of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p'}, i = 1, 2$ is the summation of the entries of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I},p}$ as we discussed in Proposition 11. Therefore $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_1,p'} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{I}_2,p'}$. Similarly, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_1,p'} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathcal{K}_2,p'}$. It follows that E_1 and E_2 are p'-equivalent. Hence $\mathfrak{E}_p \leq \mathfrak{E}_{p'}$. ■

For notational convenience, let p_0 be a virtual partiton such that $\{\mathcal{N}\} \leq p_0$ and $\mathcal{E}_n$ be the only p_0-orbit. Hence all facets of Γ_n are p_0-equivalent. For $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_n \cup \{p_0\}$ such that $p \leq p'$, by Lemma 10, each $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{E}_{p'}$ can be partitioned into some p-orbits. For a particular $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{E}_{p'}$, let $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E},p}$ be the family of all such p-orbits. Note that $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E},p}$ is a subset of $\mathfrak{E}_p$ and the union of all members of $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E},p}$ is $\mathcal{E}$.

Definition 13 (Isolation): Let $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_n \cup \{p_0\}$ such that $p \leq p'$. For $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{E}_{p'}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{F},p}$, $\mathbf{i} \in \Psi_p$ is called an *isolation* of $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{F},p}$ if for any $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $\mathbf{i} \notin E \cap S_p$ but for all $E' \in (\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E})$, $\mathbf{i} \in E' \cap S_p$. We also say $\mathcal{E}$ has an isolation $\mathbf{i}$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{F},p}$.

Lemma 11: If each $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{F},p}$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{F},p}$, for any non p-equivalent $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, neither $E_1 \cap S_p \subset E_2 \cap S_p$ nor $E_2 \cap S_p \subset E_1 \cap S_p$.

Proof: By the definition, if $\mathcal{E}$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{F},p}$, for all $E \in \mathcal{E}$ and all $E' \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E}$, $E' \cap S_p \not\subset E \cap S_p$. Then the lemma follows. ■

Example 2: Let $p' = p_0, p = \{\mathcal{N}\}$. By Example 1, $\mathfrak{N}_p = \{[(1),(0)]\} \cup \{[(2),(k)] : k = 0, \cdots, n-2\}$. It can be checked that for the uniform matroid $U_{n,n}$, whose rank function is $U_{n,n}(\mathcal{A}) = |\mathcal{A}|, \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{s}(U_{n,n}, p)$ satisfies,

$$s_n > s_{n-1},$$

$$2s_{i+1} = s_i + s_{i+2},\ i = 0, \cdots, n-2.$$

Hence, for any $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([(1),(0)])$, the uniform matroid $U_{n,n} \notin E \cap S_{[n]}$, but for any $E \in \mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{N}_p$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \neq [(1),(0)]$, $U_{n,n} \in E \cap S_p$. Therefore $U_{n,n}$ is an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p([(1),(0)])$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{n,n}}$.

Similarly, for a particular $k = 0, \cdots, n-2$, uniform matroid $U_{k+1,n}$ with rank function $U_{k+1,n}(\mathcal{A}) = \min\{k+1, |\mathcal{A}|\}, \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{s}(U_{k+1,n}, p)$ satisfies,

$$2s_{k+1} > s_k + s_{k+2},$$

$$s_n = s_{n-1},$$

$$2s_{i+1} = s_i + s_{i+2},\ i = 0, \cdots, n-2,\ i \neq k.$$

So $U_{k+1,n} \notin E \cap S_p$, for any $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([(2),(k)])$ but for any $E \in \mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{N}_p$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \neq [(2),(k)]$, $U_{k+1,n} \in E \cap S_p$. Therefore $U_{k+1,n}$ is an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p([(2),(k)])$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{n,n}}$. ■

Example 2 discussed the case when p is the one-partition. The following lemma studies the case when p is a two-partition which is covered by the one-partition $p' = \mathcal{N}$.

Lemma 12: Let $p' = \mathcal{N}$ and $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2\} \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}$. For a particular $\boldsymbol{\lambda}' \in \mathfrak{N}_{p'}$ and each $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{N}_p$ such that $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \in \mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$, $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$.

The proof of Lemma 12 is given after Lemmas 13.

The following discussion facilitates the proof of Lemma 12. For $p' = \mathcal{N}$ and $p = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2\} \in \mathcal{P}_{2,n}$, for $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \in \mathfrak{E}_p$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{N}_p$, let $J_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \subset \Gamma_n$ be the set of all isolations of $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$ for some $\boldsymbol{\lambda}' \in \mathfrak{N}_{p'}$. Note that because each $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ belongs to a unique $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$, we do not need to specify which $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$ the p-orbit $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ belongs to in the notation $J_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$.

For $\mathcal{E}_{p'}([(1),(0)])$, it can be seen that $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}([(1),(0)]),p}$ contains two members,

- $\mathcal{E}_p([(1,0),(0,0)])$, the p-orbit of all $E(i)$ such that $i \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and
- $\mathcal{E}_p([(0,1),\ (0,0)])$, the p-orbit of all $E(i)$ such that $i \in \mathcal{N}_2$.

For $\mathbf{i} \in J_p([(1,0),(0,0)])$, by the definition of an isolation, $\mathbf{i} \notin E \cap S_p$ for $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([(1,0),(0,0)])$. Then by (9), $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i}, p)$ satisfies $s_{n_1,n_2} > s_{n_1-1,n_2}$. Similarly, as $\mathbf{i} \in E \cap S_p$ for $E \in \mathcal{E}_p([(0,1),(0,0)])$, $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1,n_2-1}$. Therefore,

$$J_p([(1,0),(0,0)]) = \{\mathbf{i} \in \Psi_p : s_{n_1,n_2} > s_{n_1-1,n_2},\ s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1,n_2-1}\}. \tag{73}$$

Region $J_p([(0,1),(0,0)])$ can be obtained from (73) by symmetry.

For $\mathcal{E}_p([(2),(k)]), k=0,\cdots,n-2$, the members in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_p([(2),(k)]),p}$ are

- $\mathcal{E}_p([(1,1),(k_1,k_2)])$, $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ with $k_1+k_2=k$ and $k_i\neq n_i, i=1,2$;
- $\mathcal{E}_p([(2,0),(k_1,k_2)])$, $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ with $k_1+k_2=k$ and $k_1\neq n_1-1,n_1$;
- $\mathcal{E}_p([(0,2),(k_1,k_2)])$, $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ with $k_1+k_2=k$, $k_2\neq n_2-1,n_2$. $\mathcal{K}\cap\mathcal{N}_l=k_l, l=1,2$.

Therefore, by the definition of an isolation and (10) and (11), for fixed (k_1,k_2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&J_p([(1,1),(k_1,k_2)])\\
&\quad=\{\mathbf{h}\in\Psi_p: s_{k_1+1,k_2}+s_{k_1,k_2+1}>s_{k_1,k_2}+s_{k_1+1,k_2+1},\\
&\quad s_{i+1,j}+s_{i,j+1}=s_{i,j}+s_{i+1,j+1},\ (i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p, i\neq n_1, j\neq n_2, i+j=k_1+k_2,\ (i,j)\neq(k_1,k_2),\\
&\quad 2s_{i+1,j}=s_{i,j}+s_{i+2,j},\ (i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p, i\neq n_1-1,n_1, i+j=k_1+k_2,\\
&\quad 2s_{i,j+1}=s_{i,j}+s_{i,j+2},\ (i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p, j\neq n_2-1,n_2, i+j=k_1+k_2\}.
\end{aligned}\tag{74}$$

Similarly, for fixed (k_1,k_2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&J_p([(2,0),(k_1,k_2)])\\
&\quad=\{\mathbf{h}\in\Psi_p: 2s_{k_1+1,k_2}>s_{k_1,k_2}+s_{k_1+2,k_2},\\
&\quad s_{i+1,j}+s_{i,j+1}=s_{i,j}+s_{i+1,j+1},\ (i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p, i\neq n_1, j\neq n_2, i+j=k_1+k_2,\\
&\quad 2s_{i+1,j}=s_{i,j}+s_{i+2,j},\ (i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p, i\neq n_1-1,n_1, i+j=k_1+k_2, (i,j)\neq(k_1,k_2),\\
&\quad 2s_{i,j+1}=s_{i,j}+s_{i,j+2},\ (i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p, j\neq n_2-1,n_2, i+j=k_1+k_2.\}
\end{aligned}\tag{75}$$

Region $J_p([(0,2),(k_1,k_2)])$ can be obtained from (75) by symmetry.

Thus, to prove Lemma 12 is indeed to prove that $J_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ for all $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_p$ are nonempty. Before we prove Lemma 12, we first present a technical lemma.

Lemma 13: Let $p=\{\mathcal{N}_1,\mathcal{N}_2\}\in\mathcal{P}_{2,n}$. For a fixed $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ such that $k_i\neq n_i$, let $l_m=k_m+1, m=1,2$. Then $\mathbf{i}\in S_p$ with $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},p)$ satisfying

$$s_{i,j}=\begin{cases}
in_2+jn_1-ij & 0\le i\le l_1, 0\le j\le l_2 \text{ or } l_1+1\le i\le n_1, l_2+1\le j\le n_2\\
jl_1-(j-l_2)\max\{0,l_1-i-1\}+i(n_2-j)+j(n_1-l_1) & 0\le i\le l_1, l_2+1\le j\le n_2\\
il_2-(i-l_1)\max\{0,l_2-j-1\}+j(n_1-i)+i(n_2-l_2) & l_1+1\le i\le n_1, 0\le j\le l_2
\end{cases}\tag{76}$$

is in $J_p([(1,1),(k_1,k_2)])$.

The proof of Lemma 13 will be deferred to the end of this appendix. With this lemma, we are now ready to prove Lemma 12.

Proof of Lemma 12 We first consider $\mathbf{i}\in J_p([(1,0),(0,0)])$. Let

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathcal{A})=|\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{N}_1|,\ \mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{N}.\tag{77}$$

Then $\mathbf{i}$ is a matroid on $\mathcal{N}$ with U_{n_1,n_1} as its submatroid on $\mathcal{N}_1$ and elements in $\mathcal{N}_2$ as loops. As the entries of $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},p)$, by (77), $s_{i,j}=i$ for all $(i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p$. It can be checked by (73) that $\mathbf{i}\in J_p([(1,0),(0,0)])$. Similarly, we can prove $J_p([(0,1),(0,0)])$ is also nonempty.

Now we consider $J_p([(2,0),(k_1,k_2)])$ with $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ and $k_1\neq n_1-1,n_1$. Let

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathcal{A})=\min\{|\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{N}_1|,k_1+1\},\ \mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{N}. \tag{78}$$

Then $\mathbf{i}$ is a matroid on $\mathcal{N}$ with U_{k_1+1,n_1} as its submatroid on $\mathcal{N}_1$ and elements in $\mathcal{N}_2$ as loops. As the entries of $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},p)$, by (78), $s_{i,j}=\min\{i,k_1+1\}$ for all $(i,j)\in\mathcal{N}_p$. It can be checked by (75) that $\mathbf{i}\in J_p([(2,0),(k_1,k_2)])$. Similarly, we can prove $J_p([(0,2),(k_1,k_2)])$ with $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ and $k_2\neq n_2-1,n_2$ is also nonempty.

Finally, by Lemma 13, for any $(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{N}_p$ with $k_i\neq n_i, i=1,2$, $J_p([(1,1),(k_1,k_2)])$ is nonempty. ■

Lemma 12 can be generalized from the two-partition case to the multi-partition case, which will be stated in the next lemma whose proof will also be deferred to the end of this appendix.

Lemma 14: Let $p,p'\in\mathcal{P}_n$ and p' covers p. For any $\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}')\in\mathfrak{E}_{p'}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_{p'}$, for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_p$, $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\in\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$.

Proof of Lemma 4 We prove the lemma by induction on the lattice $\mathcal{P}_n$. First, we show that this lemma is true for $p=\{\mathcal{N}\}$. From Example 2, we see that for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_n$, $\mathcal{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ has an isolation $U_{k,n}$ in $\mathfrak{E}_n$. Then the lemma follows immediately from Lemma 11.

Then it is sufficient to prove that if the lemma is true for $p'\in\mathcal{P}_{t-1,n}$, it is also true for any $p\in\mathcal{P}_{t,n}$ covered by p'. Now assume that the lemma is true for a fixed $p'\in\mathcal{P}_{t-1,n}$, and consider any $p\in\mathcal{P}_{t,n}$ covered by p'. Let E_1,E_2 be two facets of Γ_n which are not p-equivalent. If E_1,E_2 are not p'-equivalent, by the induction hypothesis, $E_1\cap S_{p'}\not\subset E_2\cap S_{p'}$. As $p\leq p'$, by Proposition 11, $S_{p'}\subset S_p$. So if $E_1\cap S_p\subset E_2\cap S_p$, then $E_1\cap S_p\cap S_{p'}\subset E_2\cap S_p\cap S_{p'}$, which implies that $E_1\cap S_{p'}\subset E_2\cap S_{p'}$, a contradiction. Therefore $E_1\cap S_p\not\subset E_2\cap S_p$. Similarly, $E_2\cap S_p\not\subset E_1\cap S_p$.

Then it remains to prove the case that E_1 and E_2 are p'-equivalent but not p-equivalent. To this end, in light of Lemma 11, it suffices to prove that, for any $\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}')\in\mathfrak{E}_{p'}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_{p'}$, for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_p$, $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\in\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$. This is what we have proved in Lemma 14. Then this lemma follows. ■

Proof of Lemma 13 To prove that $\mathbf{i}\in S_p$ with $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},q)$ satisfying (76) is in $J_p([(1,1),(k_1,k_2)])$, we need to check that first $\mathbf{i}\in\Gamma_n$, i.e., $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},q)$ satisfies

$$s_{n_1,n_2}\geq s_{n_1-1,n_2} \tag{79}$$

$$s_{n_1,n_2}\geq s_{n_1,n_2-1} \tag{80}$$

$$2s_{i+1,j}\geq s_{i,j}+s_{i+2,j}\quad 0\leq i\leq n_1-2, 0\leq j\leq n_2 \tag{81}$$

$$2s_{i,j+1}\geq s_{i,j}+s_{i,j+2}\quad 0\leq i\leq n_1, 0\leq j\leq n_2-2 \tag{82}$$

$$s_{i+1,j}+s_{i,j+1}\geq s_{i,j}+s_{i+1,j+1}\quad 0\leq i\leq n_1, 0\leq j\leq n_2-2 \tag{83}$$

(cf. (9)-(11)) and second it satisfies (74), i.e.,

$$s_{l_1,l_2-1} + s_{l_1-1,l_2} > s_{l_1-1,l_2-1} + s_{l_1,l_2} \tag{84}$$

$$s_{i+1,j} + s_{i,j+1} = s_{i,j} + s_{i+1,j+1} \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{N}_p; i \neq n_1; j \neq n_2; i+j = l_1+l_2-2;\ (i,j) \neq (l_1-1, l_2-1) \tag{85}$$

$$2s_{i+1,j} = s_{i,j} + s_{i+2,j} \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{N}_p; i \neq n_1-1, n_1; i+j = l_1+l_2-2 \tag{86}$$

$$2s_{i,j+1} = s_{i,j} + s_{i,j+2} \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{N}_p; j \neq n_2-1, n_2; i+j = l_1+l_2-2 \tag{87}$$

Note that the above are obtained by replacing k_m by $l_m - 1, m = 1, 2$ in (74).

Now we do the checking. According to (76), let

- $\mathcal{A} = \{(i,j) : 0 \leq i \leq l_1, 0 \leq j \leq l_2\}$,
- $\mathcal{B} = \{(i,j) : 0 \leq i \leq l_1, l_2+1 \leq j \leq n_2\}$,
- $\mathcal{C} = \{(i,j) : l_1+1 \leq i \leq n_1, 0 \leq j \leq l_2\}$ and
- $\mathcal{D} = \{(i,j) : l_1+1 \leq i \leq n_1, l_2+1 \leq j \leq n_2\}$

be the four blocks of a partition of $\mathcal{N}_p$.

For an inequality in (79)-(83), if the indices of all the terms are in a particular block, say $\mathcal{A}$, we say that the inequality is in $\mathcal{A}$; otherwise, if the indices are in more than one block, say $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we say the inequality is between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. If the condition that guarantees the existence of the inequalities does not hold, then the inequality does not need to be considered for the chosen set of parameter.

We will check that (79)-(83) hold, which proves that $\mathbf{i} \in \Gamma_n$. During the process, by noting which inequality hold with equality and which hold strictly, we can verify the equalities or inequalities in (84)-(87) along the way. The details are given below, where the checking of (79)-(83) are organized according to the indices involved in the inequalities. Table II indicates how the inequalities and equalities in (67)-(70) are verified in the process. For example, (84) is verified under Inequalities in $\mathcal{A}$, and (85) is verified under Inequalities in $\mathcal{B}$, Inequalities in $\mathcal{C}$, Inequalities in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, and Inequalities in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ for the corresponding ranges of (i,j), respectively.

The result of the check are listed in Table II. Then we can prove that $\mathbf{i} \in J_p([(1,1),(k_1,k_2)])$. The details are given below.

Inequalities in $\mathcal{A}$:

- (81) holds with equality since the first case in (76) gives

$$s_{i,j} = in_2 + jn_1 - ij \tag{88}$$

  which is linear in i for a fixed j. When $i = l_1 - 2, j = l_2$, it proves (86) holds for such i, j.
- (82): it holds with equality since $s_{i,j}$ above is linear in j for a fixed i. When $i = l_1$ and $j = l_2 - 2$, it proves that (87) holds for such i and j.
- (83) holds strictly since

$$\begin{aligned}&(s_{i+1,j} + s_{i,j+1}) - (s_{i,j} + s_{i+1,j+1})\\ &\quad = ((-(i+1)j) + (-i(j+1))) - (-ij - (i+1)(j+1))\end{aligned}$$

$$= 1.$$

When $i = l_1 - 1, j = l_2 - 1$, it proves that (84) holds.

- If $l_1 = n_1$ and $l_2 = n_2$, (79) is in $\mathcal{A}$ and it holds with equality since $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1-1,n_2} = n_1 n_2$.
- If $l_1 = n_1$ and $l_2 = n_2$, (80) is in $\mathcal{A}$ and it holds with equality since $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1-1,n_2} = n_1 n_2$.

Inequalities in $\mathcal{B}$:

The second case in (76) can be written in two subcases ($0 \le i \le l_1 - 1$ and $i = l_1$) as

$$s_{i,j} = l_1 l_2 + j - l_2 + i(n_2 - l_2) + j(n_1 - l_1) \quad \text{if } 0 \le i \le l_1 - 1, \tag{89}$$

$$s_{l_1,j} = l_1 n_2 + j(n_1 - l_1). \tag{90}$$

- (81) with $i \le l_1 - 3$ holds with equality since (89) is linear in i for a fixed j. When $i \le l_1 - 3$ and $i + j = l_1 + l_2 - 2$, it proves (86) holds for such i, j.
- (81) with $i = l_1 - 2$ holds strictly since by (89) and (90)

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{l_1-1,j} - s_{l_1-2,j} - s_{l_1,j} \\
&\quad = 2(l_1 l_2 + j - l_2 + (l_1 - 1)(n_2 - l_2) + j(n_1 - l_1)) \\
&\qquad - (l_1 l_2 + j - l_2 + (l_1 - 2)(n_2 - l_2) + j(n_1 - l_1)) - (l_1 n_2 + j(n_1 - l_1)) \\
&\quad = j - l_2 > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- (82) holds with equality since (89) is linear in j for a fixed i and (90) is linear in j. When $i \le l_1 - 3$ and $i + j = l_1 + l_2 - 2$, it proves (87) holds for such i, j.
- (83) with $i \le l_1 - 2$ holds with equality since by (89)

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_{i+1,j} + s_{i,j+1}) - (s_{i,j} + s_{i+1,j+1}) \\
&\quad = (s_{i,j+1} - s_{i,j}) - (s_{i+1,j+1} - s_{i+1,j}) \\
&\quad = (1 + n_1 - l_1) - (1 + n_1 - l_2) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

When $i \le l_1 - 3$ and $i + j = l_1 + l_2 - 2$, it proves (85) holds for such i, j.

- (83) with $i = l_1 - 1$ holds strictly since by (89) and (90)

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_{l_1,j} + s_{l_1-1,j+1}) - (s_{l_1-1,j} + s_{l_1,j+1}) \\
&\quad = (s_{l_1-1,j+1} - s_{l_1-1,j}) - (s_{l_1,j+1} - s_{i_1,j}) \\
&\quad = (1 + n_1 - l_1) - (n_1 - l_2) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

- If $l_1 = n_1$, (79) is in this block and it holds with equality since by (89) and (90), $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1-1,n_2} = n_1 n_2$.
- If $l_1 = n_1$ and $l_2 \le n_2 - 2$, (80) is in this block and it holds with equality since by (90), $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1,n_2-1} = n_1 n_2$.

Inequalities in $\mathcal{C}$:

These inequalities are symmetrical to those inequalities in $\mathcal{B}$. The details are ommited here.

Inequalities in $\mathcal{D}$:

- (81), (82) and (83) hold by the same reason as they in $\mathcal{A}$.
- If $l_1 \leq n_1 - 2$ and $l_2 \leq n_2 - 1$ (79) is in this block and it holds by the same reason in $\mathcal{A}$.
- If $l_1 \leq n_1 - 1$ and $l_2 \leq n_2 - 2$, (80) is in this block and it holds by the same reason in $\mathcal{A}$.

Inequalities between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$:

- (82) with $i \leq l_1 - 1$, $j = l_2 - 1$ holds since by (88) and (89),

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{i,l_2} - s_{i,l_2-1} - s_{i,l_2+1} \\
&\quad = 2(in_2 + l_2n_1 - il_2) - (in_2 + (l_2-1)n_1 - i(l_2-1)) - (l_1l_2 + 1 + i(n_2 - l_2) + (l_2+1)(n_1 - l_1)) \\
&\quad = l_1 - i - 1 \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

  Furthermore, when $i = l_1 - 1$ and $j = l_2 - 1$, it holds with equality which proves (87) for such i and j.

- (82) with $i = l_1$, $j = l_2 - 1$ holds with equality since by (88) and (90),

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{l_1,l_2} - s_{l_1,l_2-1} - s_{l_1,l_2+1} \\
&\quad = 2(l_1n_2 + l_2n_1 - l_1l_2) - (l_1n_2 + (l_2-1)n_1 - l_1(l_2-1)) - (l_1n_2 + (l_2+1)(n_1 - l_1)) \\
&\quad = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- (82) with $i \leq l_1 - 1$, $j = l_2$ holds with equality since by in (88) and (89),

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{i,l_2+1} - s_{i,l_2+2} - s_{i,l_2} \\
&\quad = 2(l_1l_2 + 1 + i(n_2 - l_2) + (l_2+1)(n_1 - l_1)) \\
&\qquad - (l_1l_2 + 2 + i(n_2 - l_2) + (l_2+2)(n_1 - l_1)) - (in_2 + l_2n_1 - il_2) \\
&\quad = 0;
\end{aligned}$$

  When $i = l_1 - 2$ and $j = l_2$, it proves (87) for such i and j.

- (82) with $i = l_1$, $j = l_2$ holds with equality since by in (88) and (90),

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{l_1,l_2+1} - s_{l_1,l_2+2} - s_{l_1,l_2} \\
&\quad = 2(l_1n_2 + (l_2+1)(n_1 - l_1)) - (l_1n_2 + (l_2+2)(n_1 - l_1)) - (l_1n_2 + l_2n_1 - l_1l_2) \\
&\quad = 0;
\end{aligned}$$

- (83) with $i \leq l_1 - 2$, $j = l_2$ holds with equality since by (88) and (89),

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_{i+1,l_2} + s_{i,l_2+1}) - (s_{i,l_2} + s_{i+1,l_2+1}) \\
&\quad = (s_{i+1,l_2} - s_{i,l_2}) - (s_{i+1,l_2+1} - s_{i,l_2+1}) \\
&\quad = (n_2 - l_2) - (n_2 - l_2) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

	Inequalities in $\mathcal{A}$	Inequalities in $\mathcal{B}$	Inequalities in $\mathcal{C}$	Inequalities between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$	Inequalities between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$
(84)	·				
(85)		$\max\{0, n_1 - l_1 - l_2 + 1\}$ $\leq i \leq l_1 - 3$ $j = l_1 + l_2 - 2 - i$	$(i,j) : l_1 + 1 \leq i \leq$ $\min\{n_1 - 1, l_1 + l_2 - 2\}$ $j = l_1 + l_2 - 2 - i$	$(i,j) =$ $(l_1 - 2, l_2)$	$(i,j) =$ $(l_1, l_2 - 2)$
(86)	$(l_1 - 2, l_2)$	$\max\{0, n_1 - l_1 - l_2 + 2\}$ $\leq i \leq l_1 - 3$ $j = l_1 + l_2 - 2 - i$	$l_1 + 1 \leq i \leq$ $\min\{n_1 - 2, l_1 + l_2 - 2\}$ $j = l_1 + l_2 - 2 - i$		$(i,j) =$ $(l_1 - 1, l_2 - 1)$ or $(l_1, l_2 - 2)$
(87)	$(l_1, l_2 - 2)$	$\max\{0, n_1 - l_1 - l_2\}$ $\leq i \leq l_1 - 3$ $j = l_1 + l_2 - 2 - i$	$l_1 + 1 \leq i \leq$ $\min\{n_1, l_1 + l_2 - 2\}$ $j = l_1 + l_2 - 2 - i$	$(i,j) =$ $(l_1 - 2, l_2)$ or $(l_1 - 1, l_2 - 1)$	

TABLE II

VERIFICATION OF (84)-(87)

When $i = l_1 - 1$ and $i + j = l_1 + l_2 - 2$, it proves (85) holds for such i and j.

- (83) with $i = l_1 - 1$, $j = l_2$ holds strictly since by (88) and (90),

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_{l_1,l_2} + s_{l_1-1,l_2+1}) - (s_{l_1-1,l_2} + s_{l_1,l_2+1}) \\
&\quad = (s_{l_1,l_2} - s_{l_1-1,l_2}) - (s_{l_1,l_2+1} - s_{l_1-1,l_2+1}) \\
&\quad = (n_2 - l_2) - (n_2 - l_2 - 1) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

- If $l_1 = n_1$ and $l_2 = n_2 - 1$, (80) is in this case and it holds with equality since by (88) and (90), $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{n_1,n_2-1} = n_1, n_2$.

Inequalities between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$:

These inequalities are symmetrical to those inequalities between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. The details are ommited here.

Inequalities between $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{D}$:

- (81) with $i = l_1 - 1$ holds with equality since by (88), (89) and (90),

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{l_1,j} - s_{l_1-1,j} - s_{l_1+1,j} \\
&\quad = 2(l_1 n_2 + j(n_1 - l_1)) - (l_1 l_2 + j - l_2 + (l_1 - 1)(n_2 - l_2) + j(n_1 - l_1)) \\
&\qquad - ((l_1 + 1)n_2 + jn_1 - (l_1 + 1)j) \\
&\quad = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- (81) with $i = l_1$ holds with equality since by (88) and (90),

$$\begin{aligned}
&2s_{l_1+1,j} - s_{l_1,j} - s_{l_1+2,j} \\
&\quad = 2((l_1 + 1)n_2 + jn_1 - (l_1 + 1)j) - (l_1 n_2 + j(n_1 - l_1)) - ((l_1 + 2)n_2 + jn_1 - (l_1 + 2)j)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= 0.$$

- (83) with $i = l_1$ holds strictly since by (88) and (90),

$$\begin{aligned}&(s_{l_1+1,j} + s_{l_1,j+1}) - (s_{l_1,j} + s_{l_1+1,j+1})\\ &\quad= (s_{l_1,j+1} - s_{l_1,j}) - (s_{l_1+1,j+1} - s_{l_1,j+1})\\ &\quad= (n_1 - l_1) - (n_1 - l_1 - 1) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

- If $l_1 = n_1 - 1$, (79) belongs to this case and it holds since by (88) and (90), $s_{n_1,n_2} = s_{s_{n_1-1,n_2}} = n_1 n_2$.

Inequalities between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$:

These inequalities are symmetrical to those inequalities between $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. The details are ommited here.

Inequalities between $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$:

- (83) with $i = l_1$ and $j = l_2$ holds strictly since by (76),

$$\begin{aligned}&(s_{l_1+1,l_2} + s_{l_1,l_2+1}) - (s_{l_1,l_2} + s_{l_1+1,l_2+1})\\ &\quad= (l_2 n_1 + (l_1+1)(n_2 - l_2) + l_1 n_2 + (l_2+1)(n_1 - l_1))\\ &\qquad- (l_1 n_2 + l_2 n_1 - l_1 l_2 + (l_1+1)n_2 + (l_2+1)n_1 - (l_1+1)(l_2+1))\\ &\quad= 1.\end{aligned}$$

■

Proof of Lemma 14 Without loss of generality, we assume $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}_n^*$ and the first block p' is the union of the first two blocks of p and the other blocks of p' are the other corresponding blocks of p, i.e., $\mathcal{N}'_1 = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2 = \{1, \cdots, n'_1\}$ and $\mathcal{N}'_i = \mathcal{N}_{i+1}, l = 2, \cdots, t-1$ and furthermore $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{1, \cdots, n_1\}, \mathcal{N}_2 = \{n_1+1, \cdots, n'_1\}$. With this assumption, we have $n'_1 = n_1 + n_2$ and $n'_i = n_{i+1}$, $i = 2, \cdots, t-1$.

By the discussion above (12), $\mathfrak{E}_{p'} = \{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}') : \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \in \mathfrak{N}_{p'}\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{N}_{p'} =&\mathfrak{N}_A \cup \mathfrak{N}_B \cup \mathfrak{N}_C\\ =&\{[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(l), \mathbf{0}_{t-1}] : 1 \le l \le t-1\}\\ &\cup \{[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(l_1, l_2), (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1})] : 1 \le l_1 < l_2 \le t-1, (k'_1, \cdots, k'_t) \in \mathcal{N}_{p'}, k'_{l_1} \ne n'_{l_1}, k'_{l_2} \ne n'_{l_2}\}\\ &\cup \{[\mathbf{2}_{t-1}(l), (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1})] : 1 \le l \le t-1, (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{N}_{p'}, k'_l \ne n'_l - 1, n'_l\}.\end{aligned}$$

For the convenience of our discussion, we partition $\mathfrak{N}_{p'}$ into the following five disjoint subsets,

1) $\mathfrak{N}_1 \triangleq \{[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(1), \mathbf{0}_{t-1}]\} \cup \{[\mathbf{2}_{t-1}(1), (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1})] : (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{N}_{p'}, k'_1 \ne n'_1 - 1, n'_1\}$;
2) $\mathfrak{N}_2 \triangleq \{[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(1, l), (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1})] : 2 \le l \le t-1, (k'_1, \cdots, k'_t) \in \mathcal{N}_{p'}, k'_1 \ne n'_1, k'_l \ne n'_l\}$;
3) $\mathfrak{N}_3 \triangleq \{[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(l), \mathbf{0}_{t-1}] : 2 \le l \le t-1\}$;
4) $\mathfrak{N}_4 \triangleq \{[\mathbf{2}_{t-1}(l), (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1})] : 2 \le l \le t-1, (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{N}_{p'}, k'_l \ne n'_l - 1, n'_l\}$;
5) $\mathfrak{N}_5 \triangleq \{[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(l_1, l_2), (k'_1, \cdots, k'_{t-1})] : 2 \le l_1 < l_2 \le t-1, (k'_1, \cdots, k'_t) \in \mathcal{N}_{p'}, k'_{l_1} \ne n'_{l_1}, k'_{l_2} \ne n'_{l_2}\}$.

Note that $\mathfrak{N}_1$ is composed of those $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ in $\mathcal{N}_A$ or $\mathcal{N}_C$ such that $l=1$, that is, for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_1$, $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ contains $E(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{K})$ such that $\mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{N}_1'$. Subset $\mathfrak{N}_2\subset\mathfrak{N}_B$ and for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_2$, $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ contains $E(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{K})$ such that $|\mathcal{I}\cap\mathcal{N}_1'|=1$. For the remaining, we have $\mathfrak{N}_3=\mathfrak{N}_A\setminus\mathfrak{N}_1$, $\mathfrak{N}_4=\mathfrak{N}_C\setminus\mathfrak{N}_1$ and $\mathfrak{N}_5=\mathfrak{N}_B\setminus\mathfrak{N}_2$.

$\underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_1:}$

Consider $q=\{\mathcal{N}_1,\mathcal{N}_2\}$ and $q'=\{\mathcal{N}_1'\}$ in $\mathcal{P}_{n_1'}$. By Lemma 12, for every particular $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'\in\mathfrak{N}_{q'}$ and each $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\in\mathfrak{N}_q$ such that $\mathcal{E}_q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})\in\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{[q']}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'),q}$, $\mathcal{E}_q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{q'}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'),q}$. For $E(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{K})\in\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}')$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_1$, since $\mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{N}_1'$, they can be treated as $E(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{K}')\in\mathcal{E}_{n_1'}$ with $\mathcal{K}'=\mathcal{K}\cap\mathcal{N}_1'$. The details are explained in the following.

For $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_{p'}$, let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(1)$ denote the pair of the first entry of the two vectors in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'$. For $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_p$, let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(1,2)$ denote the pair of the first two entries of the two vectors in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. For example, $[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(1),\mathbf{0}_{t-1}](1)=[(1),(0)]$ and $[\mathbf{1}_t(1),\mathbf{0}_t](1,2)=[(1,0),(0,0)]$. Now for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_1$, it can be seen that there exists $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'\in\mathfrak{N}_{q'}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(1)=\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'$. Observe that there exists a bijection $\omega_{\lambda'}:\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}\to\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{q'}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'),q}$ defined by

$$\omega_{\lambda'}(\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}))=\mathcal{E}_q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})\text{ if }\boldsymbol{\lambda}(1,2)=\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}.$$

For example, for $[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(1),\mathbf{0}_{t-1}]\in\mathfrak{N}_1$, $[\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(1),\mathbf{0}_{t-1}](1)=[(1),(0)]\in\mathfrak{N}_{q'}$. Note that $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}([\mathbf{1}_{t-1}(1),\mathbf{0}_{t-1}]),p}=\{\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t(1),\mathbf{0}_t]),\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t(2),\mathbf{0}_t])\}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{q'}([(1),(0)]),q}=\{\mathcal{E}_q([(1,0),(0,0)]),\mathcal{E}_q([(0,1),(0,0)])\}$. It can be checked that $[\mathbf{1}_t(1),\mathbf{0}_t](1,2)=[(1,0),(0,0)]$ and $[\mathbf{1}_t(2),\mathbf{0}_t](1,2)=[(0,1),(0,0)]$.

Let $\mathbf{i}_q$ be an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{q'}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}'),q}$. Define $\mathbf{i}_p$ by

$$\mathbf{i}_p(\mathcal{A})=\mathbf{i}_q(\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{N}_1'),\ \mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{N}. \tag{91}$$

It can be checked that $\mathbf{i}_p$ is an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$. For example, let $\mathbf{i}_q$ be an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_q([(1,0),(0,0)])$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{q'}([(1),(0)]),q}$. Then by (73), $\mathbf{s}^q\triangleq\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i}_q,q)$ satisfies

$$s^q_{n_1,n_2}>s^q_{n_1-1,n_2},\ s^q_{n_1,n_2}=s^q_{n_1,n_2-1}.$$

By (91), $\mathbf{s}^p\triangleq\mathbf{s}_p(\mathbf{i}_p,p)$ satisfies $s^p_{n_1,n_2,n_3,\cdots,n_t}=s^q_{n_1,n_2}$, $s^p_{n_1-1,n_2,n_3,\cdots,n_t}=s^q_{n_1-1,n_2}$ and $s^p_{n_1,n_2-1,n_3,\cdots,n_t}=s^q_{n_1,n_2-1}$ which implies that

$$s^p_{n_1,\cdots,n_t}>s^p_{n_1-1,n_2,\cdots,n_t},\ s^p_{n_1,\cdots,n_t}=s^p_{n_1,n_2-1,n_3,\cdots,n_t}.$$

Hence $\mathbf{i}_p$ is an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t,\mathbf{0}_t])$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}([\mathbf{1}_{t-1},\mathbf{0}_{t-1}]),p}$.

$\underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_2:}$

For this case, we have $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}=\{\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}):\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\{[\mathbf{1}_t(1,l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]:(k_1,\cdots,k_t)\in\mathcal{N}_p,k_1\neq n_1,\ k_1+k_2=k_1',k_i=k_{i-1}',i=3,\cdots,t\}\cup\{[\mathbf{1}_t(2,l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]:(k_1,\cdots,k_t)\in\mathcal{N}_p,k_2\neq n_2,\ k_1+k_2=k_1',k_i=k_{i-1}',i=3,\cdots,t\}\}$. We only need to treat the case that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ has the form $[\mathbf{1}_t(1,l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]$; the other case follows by symmetry. Fix $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=[\mathbf{1}_t(1,l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]$ where $(k_1,\cdots,k_t)\in\mathcal{N}_p,k_1\neq n_1,\ k_1+k_2=k_1',k_i=k_{i-1}',i=3,\cdots,t$. Let $\mathbf{i}$ be a matroid on $\mathcal{N}$ with $U_{k_1+k_{l+1}+1,n_1+n_{l+1}}$ as its submatroid on $\mathcal{N}_1\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+1}$ and other elements as loops, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathcal{A})=\min\{k_1+k_{l+1}+1,|\mathcal{A}\cap(\mathcal{N}_1\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+1})|\},\ \mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{N}.$$

It can be checked that $\mathbf{s}=\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},p)$ satisfies that

$$s_{k_1+1,k_2,\cdots,k_t}+s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t}>s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_t}+s_{k_1+1,k_2,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{k+2},\cdots,k_t},$$

$$s_{i+1,j,k_3,\cdots,k_t}+s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t}=s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_t}+s_{i+1,j,k_3,\cdots,k_{l+1}+1,\cdots,k_t},\ i+j=k_1+k_2,(i,j)\neq(k_1,k_2),$$

$$s_{i,j+1,k_3,\cdots,k_t}+s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,\cdots,k_{l+2},k_t}=s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_t}+s_{i,j+1,k_3,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t},\ i+j=k_1+k_2,$$

which implies that $\mathbf{i}$ is an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=[\mathbf{1}_t(1,l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$.

$\underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_3}$:

For this case, we have $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}=\{\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t(l+1),\mathbf{0}_t])\}$, containing only one element. Therefore, all $E\in\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}')$ are p-equivalent. Then, any $\mathbf{i}\in\Psi_p$ such that $\mathbf{i}\notin E\cap S_p$ for all $E\in\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is by definition an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$.

$\underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_4}$:

For this case, we have $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}=\{\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{2}_t(l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]):(k_1,\cdots,k_t)\in\mathcal{N}_p,k_1+k_2=k_1',k_i=k_{k-1}',i=3,\cdots,t\}$. Fix $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=[\mathbf{2}_t(l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]$. Let $\mathbf{i}$ be a matroid on $\mathcal{N}$ with $U_{k_1+k_{l+1}+1,n_1+n_{l+1}}$ as its submatroid on $\mathcal{N}_1\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+1}$ and other elements as loops, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathcal{A})=\min\{k_1+k_{l+1}+1,|\mathcal{A}\cap(\mathcal{N}_1\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+1})|\},\ \mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{N}.$$

It can be checked that $\mathbf{s}=\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},p)$ satisfies

$$2s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t}>s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_t}+s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+2,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t},$$

$$2s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t}=s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_t}+s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+2,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t},\ i+j=k_1+k_2,(i,j)\neq(k_1,k_2),$$

which implies that $\mathbf{i}$ is an isolation of $\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{2}_t(l+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)])$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}([\mathbf{2}_{t-1}(l),(k_1',\cdots,k_{t-1}')]),p}$.

$\underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_5}$:

For this case, $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}=\{\mathcal{E}_p([\mathbf{1}_t(l_1+1,l_2+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]):(k_1,\cdots,k_t)\in\mathcal{N}_p,k_1+k_2=k_1',k_i=k_{k-1}',i=3,\cdots,t\}$. Fix $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=[\mathbf{1}_t(l_1+1,l_2+1),(k_1,\cdots,k_t)]$. Let $\mathbf{i}$ be a matroid on $\mathcal{N}$ with submatroid $U_{k_1+k_{l_1+1}+k_{l_2+1}+1,n_1+n_l}$ on $\mathcal{N}_1\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+1}\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+2}$ and other elements as loops, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathcal{A})=\min\{k_1+k_{l_1+1}+k_{l_2+1}+1,|\mathcal{A}\cap(\mathcal{N}_1\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+1}\cup\mathcal{N}_{l+2})|\},\ \mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{N}.$$

It can be checked that $\mathbf{s}=\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{i},p)$ satisfies

$$s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t}+s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_{l_2},k_{l_2+1}+1,k_{k_2+2}\cdots,k_t}>s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_t}+s_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_{l_1},k_{l_1+1}+1,k_{l_1+2},\cdots,k_{l_2},k_{l_2+1}+1,k_{l_2+2},\cdots,k_t},$$

$$s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_l,k_{l+1}+1,k_{l+2},\cdots,k_t}+s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_{l_2},k_{l_2+1}+1,k_{k_2+2}\cdots,k_t}=s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_t}+s_{i,j,k_3,\cdots,k_{l_1},k_{l_1+1}+1,k_{l_1+2},\cdots,k_{l_2},k_{l_2+1}+1,k_{l_2+2},\cdots,k_t},$$

$$i+j=k_1+k_2,(i,j)\neq(k_1,k_2),$$

which implies that $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$.

Now, we have proved that For any $\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}')\in\mathfrak{E}_{p'}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'\in\mathfrak{N}_{p'}$, for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\mathfrak{N}_p$, $\mathcal{E}_p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\in\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$ has an isolation in $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'),p}$. Therefore, this lemma is true. ■

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Qi Chen thanks Dr. Tarik Kaced and Dr. Satyajit Thakor for the insightful discussions. This work was partially supported by a grant from the University Grants Committee of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. AoE/E-02/08) and partially supported by grants from National Natural Science Foundation of China (Funding Code), and Shenzhen Key Laboratory of Network Coding Key Technology and Application, Shenzhen, China (ZSDY20120619151314964).

REFERENCES

[1] R. W. Yeung, "A framework for Linear Information Inequalities," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1924-1934, Nov. 1997.

[2] S. Fujishige, "Polymatroidal dependence structure of a set of random variables," *Info. Contr.*, 39: pp. 55-72,1978.

[3] R. W. Yeung, *Information Theory and Network Coding*, Springer, 2008.

[4] Z. Zhang and R. W. Yeung, "A non-Shannon type conditional inequality of information quantities," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1982-1986, Nov. 1997.

[5] F. Matúš, "Piecewise linear conditional information inequality," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 236-238, Jan. 2006.

[6] Q. Chen and R. W. Yeung. "Characterizing the entropy function region via extreme rays," IEEE Information Theory Workshop, Lausanne Switzerland, Sept. 2012.

[7] Z. Zhang and R. W. Yeung, "On characterization of entropy function via information inequalities," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 44, pp. 1440-1452, Nov. 1998.

[8] X. Yan, R. W. Yeung and Z. Zhang, "A class of non-Shannon tpye information inequalities and their applications," IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory, Washington DC, June 2001.

[9] Makarychev K, Makarychev Y, Romashchenko A, et al. "A new class of non-Shannon-type inequalities for entropies" *Communications in Information and Systems*, 2002, 2(2): 147-166.

[10] Z. Zhang "On a new non-Shannon-type information inequality." *Communications in Information and Systems*, 2003

[11] R. Doughterty, C. Freiling and K. Zeger, "Six new non-Shannon information inequalities," IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory, Seattle WA June 2006.

[12] W. Xu, J. Wang and J. Sun, "A projection method for derivation of non-Shannon-type information inequalities," IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory, Toronto, Canada June 2008.

[13] Dougherty R, Freiling C, Zeger K. "Non-shannon information inequalities in four random variables." arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.3602, 2011.

[14] F. Matúš, "Two constructions on limits of entropy functions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 320-330, Jan. 2007.

[15] F. Matúš, "Infinitely many information inequalities," IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory, Nice, France, June 2007.

[16] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quanum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[17] T. Chan, D. Guo, and R. Yeung, "Entropy functions and determinant inequalities," 2012 IEEE International Sym. on Info. Theory, Cambridge, MA, USA, Jul 1-6, 2012.

[18] T. Chan and A. Grant,"Dualities between entropy functions and network codes", *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, IT-54: 4470-4487, 2008.

[19] T. H. Chan and R. W. Yeung,"On a relation between information inequalities and group theory," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, IT-48: 1992-1995, 2002.

[20] D. Hammer, A. Romashchenko, A. Shen, and N. Vereshchagin,"Inequalities for Shan- non Entropy and Kolmogorov Complexity," *J. Comp. and Syst. Sci.*, 60: 442-464, 2000.

[21] T. H. Chan,"A combinatorial approach to information inequalities," *Comm. Info. and Syst.*, 1: 241-253, 2001.

[22] R. W. Yeung "Facts of entropy," IEEE Information Theory Society Newsletter, 2012: 6-15.

[23] T. Chan, "Recent progresses in characterizing information inequalities," *Entropy*, 13: 379-401, 2011.

[24] Kaced, Tarik, and Andrei Romashchenko. "On essentially conditional information inequalities," IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, July 31-Aug. 5, 2011.

[25] Kaced, Tarik, and Andrei Romashchenko. “On the non-robustness of essentially conditional information inequalities,” IEEE Information Theory Workshop, Lausanne Switzerland, Sept. 3-7, 2012.

[26] Kaced T, Romashchenko A. “Conditional Information Inequalities for Entropic and Almost Entropic Points,” to appear in *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*.

[27] B. Grünbaum, *Convex polytopes*, Springer, 2003.

[28] G. M. Ziegler, *Lectures on polytopes*, Springer-Verlag, 1995.

[29] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1970.

[30] J. G. Oxley, *Matroid theory*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1992.

[31] D. J. A. Welsh. *Matroid theory*, Academic Press, 1976.

[32] R. W. Yeung, S-Y. R. Li , N. Cai, Z. Zhang, “Network coding theory” . Communications and Information Theory, 2005, 2(4): 241-329.

[33] H. Q. Nguyen, “Semimodular functions and combinatorial geometries,” *Trans. AMS.*,vol. 238, pp. 355-383, April 1978.

[34] N. White, “Theory of matroids. No. 26. Cambridge University Press”, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[35] J. H. van Lint and R. M. Wilson, *A course in combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[36] J. Rotman *A first course in Abstract Algebra with applications*. AMC, 2006, 10: 12.

[37] J. D. Dixon and B. Mortimer *Permutation groups*. Springer, 1996.

[38] T. S. Han, “Nonnegative entropy mesures of multivariate symmetric correlations,” *Info. Contr.*, 36, 133-156, 1978.

[39] Q. Chen, C. He, L. Jiang and Q. Wang, “Average entropy functions,” IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory, Seoul, Korea, July 2009.

[40] Q. Chen, R.W Yeung. “Two-Partition-Symmetrical Entropy Function Regions,” IEEE Int. Theory Workshop Seville, Spain, Sept. 2013.